National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XX. NO. 10. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1859. WHOLE NO. 998.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

107 *North Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

THE SOUTHERN ULTIMATUM.

SPEECH OF THE HON. ALEX. H. STEPHENS, OF GEORGIA.

From The Augusta (Ga.) Constitutionalist.

YESTERDAY a large concourse of people assembled in the City Hall Park, to hear their Representative in Congress address them, on his resignation of the high office which they have so long conferred upon him, and which he has so honorably and so ably filled.

After some remarks in relation to State policy,

Mr. Stephens said he was gratified that his conduct in the political field had been approved; and he would briefly let his audience know how the political questions which agitated the country now stand. He alluded to his connection with the annexation of Texas—one of the most momentous questions, and the first which he had ever met with. It was a fiery ordeal, for he then stood in opposition to his friends; but a sense of duty impelled him to adopt the course he did. The secret history of the subject has never been written. The annexation of Texas secured four slave States to the Union. Without claiming any honor for himself, he stated that the resolutions that passed the Senate were drawn up by himself and Brown of Tennessee, and that Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Tyler never saw them until they were in print. In 1850, Mr. Hale asked Daniel Webster, the great constitutional expounder, whether he thought it was constitutional to admit territory, with a guarantee of four slave States, into the Union. Mr. Webster replied "I do!" This was one of the most gratifying events of his life. In six years, notwithstanding the disagreement and difficulties through which he had passed, he lived to see the ablest expounder admitting, in the face of the world, that the act of admission was constitutional, and now men of all parties and creeds agree that it was right.

A greater and fearful crisis arose—that was the question of the power of Congress over the Territories—whether new slave States should be admitted, or whether the South should never expand or enlarge; whether our institutions should be starved out; whether the South should submit to degradation. He would not give the history of those times, but simply say, in regard to the path he took, it is past: what he did is done; but whether right or wrong, the record is made up. The South was successful; she asked nothing wrong from the North, and got only what was right. He was perfectly willing to remain in the Union; but simply said, stay the hand of oppression. As much as he loved and admired the Union, it the South was to be hemmed and hedged in, he was for resistance; sooner than submit to practical or theoretical questions of wrong, he was for resistance.

He believed truth would triumph; all the South wants is decision, union, patriotism. He believed in the power and omnipotence of truth, and would ask for nothing wrong. The great principle to be carried out is expansion—the right of the people of the South to go to the Territories with their slave property, protected by the Constitution, on a platform of equal rights.

The question was fully settled as a principle that Congress should make no discrimination in regard to sectional rights in the Territories, but that the people of each Territory, when about to form a constitution as a State, should decide for themselves whether they should come into the Union as a free or slave State.

The Missouri Compromise doctrine, the Texas doctrine, the territorial doctrine of Rufus King in 1817, have all been abandoned. In the admission of this principle, it was not a triumph of the South, but a triumph of justice, truth and right. The settlement was fully up to the demands of the South. She never asks but for what is right. The principle is now settled that Congress shall abstain from all legislation on the subject of slavery in the Territories, whether as to the North or the South; and the Territories are now open to all sections, and have the privilege of adopting slavery or not, as the people may choose, when they come to form a constitution. These measures, however, did not go as far as he wished; he would have Congress to give protection to slave property in the public domain as long as it remained in a territorial condition.

Fates of empires have been settled by abstract questions. The Dred Scott decision was only in regard to one slave, but it contained an abstract question of great importance. Mr. Stephens cited several law cases where the interests immediately at stake were small, but wherein great abstract principles were contained; and asked where would have been the Dred Scott decision but for the debate in Congress? Let no man place too light an estimate upon theoretical questions. He cited our own revolution, which, as Mr. Webster says, was "fought upon a preamble." The demand of the colonies for the removal of the tea and stamp duties was granted by the British Government; but the right of taxation was asserted in the very act of revocation, and upon that the Revolution was fought. Mr. Stephens here paid a passing compliment to Ireland and her patriots and orators, and quoted the language of Edmund Burke in regard to the action of the British Government. On the same principle, let no one be deceived, or place too small an estimate on public men in their discussions, even when they threaten a dissolution of the Union, and even on an abstract principle. He would not advise the South, or any portion of the Confederacy, to remain members of a body in which they were not equal in all the principles of justice.

A majority of the South differed with him—not more than twenty-five men in Congress agreed with him—but he finally yielded to the doctrine of non-intervention, because it was not aggressive and because it secured for all practical purposes what we wanted. If climate and soil do not favor slavery, it will not go into the Territories.

Many thought all the discussion on the slavery question had nothing in it; slavery wouldn't go to Kansas, Nebraska, &c.; what harm would be done if the Wilmot proviso was passed? It is true, it was an abstract principle which had been gained; but some of the greatest questions in the governments of the world have been abstract. He would advise as strong resistance to abstract as to practical questions. Nations which submit to abstract questions of wrong will not long maintain their independence. Let no man, then, say that all their discussion about slavery in the Territories was for personal motives, and that all the details amounted to nothing.

His reason for retiring was, that all these questions are now settled. Everything human is passing away—there is nothing eternal but change. Our bodies yield to this law; death is incident to all; and governments are liable to the same law. The most powerful of the present day, even our own, must pass away. We know not when it must obey this law of change; he would not hasten its dissolution, but rather prolong its existence, and indulged in the hope that a far more glorious position even than the present one awaits us.

Mr. Stephens repeated that he had endeavored to discharge his duty faithfully. The settlement of the questions to which he had alluded was a practical good, if we are but true to ourselves; and we can divide Texas into five slave States, and get Chihuahua, Sonora, &c., if we have the slave population.

He had been asked, what are the prospects for the future? what is to become of the anti-slavery sentiment of the North, and whether slavery is as secure as it was?

As he said in 1850, he would repeat now—*there is very little prospect of the South settling any territory outside of Texas; in fact, little or no prospect at all, unless we increase our African stock.*

This question his hearers should examine in its length and breadth; he would do nothing more than present it, but it is as plain as anything that, unless the number of African stock be increased, we have not the population, and might as well abandon the race with our brethern of the North in the colonization of the Territories. It was not for him to advise on these questions—he only presented them; the people should think and act upon them. *If there are but few more slave States, it is not because of Abolitionism or the Wilmot Proviso, but simply for want of people to settle them.* We cannot make States without people; rivers and mountains do not make them; *and slave States cannot be made without Africans.* I am not telling you, he said, to do it, but it is a serious question concerning our political and domestic policy; and we do not want voters and declaimers so much as thinkers and reasoners. *It is useless to wage war about abstract rights, or to quarrel and accuse each other of unsoundness, unless we get more Africans.*

Many had asked him what he thought of public sentiment on this question? He would reply that the institution of slavery is now stronger than it was sixteen years ago, when he entered Congress. Nothing improved like it—and it is now fixed firm and secure in its position.

In his judgment ours is the only government consistent with nature. He did not agree with some as to the manner of meeting our opponents; while many persons were offended and astonished at the higher law doctrine of Seward, he believed himself in a higher law. He believed in a higher law of the Creator, and the Constitution must sustain and rest upon this higher law. The opponents of slavery were endeavoring to make things equal (black and white people) which the Creator has made unequal. Our opponents, then, are warring against a principle, while we are warring for it.

Negro slavery is but in its infancy—it is a mere problem, of our government; our fathers didn't understand it. I grant that all the public men of the South were once against it; but they didn't understand it. It is for us to meet questions with the firmness which they did. The problem is yet unsolved. Ours is not only the best, but is the only government founded upon the principles of nature. Aristotle and other ancient philosophers had failed in their theories of government. Gradation is seen in everything in nature—in the lower world, from the japonica down to the violet, in the vegetable kingdom, in the stars, and even in men. All government comes from the Creator. Statesmen never looked to the principle of gradation, but our government is the only one founded on it; and our policy, our institutions and African slavery are founded on it. It is not for us to inquire into the great mysteries of nature; and it is most foolish to attempt to make things better than God made them (applause).

Statesmen and private men should take things as God founded them, making the greatest amount of happiness out of the elements which we possess. We ought to increase and expand our institutions. If they do not increase the amount of happiness of all—black and white—then they ought to be abandoned. He repudiated the doctrine of the greatest happiness to the greatest number. One hundred persons have no right to have happiness at the expense and injury of ninety-nine. If slavery is not best for the African, and doesn't increase his happiness, it ought to be abolished. If it does, then our institutions are founded on nature—we are fulfilling our destiny, and we stand upon this higher law. He wouldn't support a constitution that was inconsistent with this higher law of nature. And until the "leopard can change his spots or the Ethiop his skin," don't tell me, he said, that it is unlawful to hold slaves.

He had been asked, with these views, what is to become of the country? Fanaticism had been spreading at the North, but slavery is getting stronger and will continue to get stronger, whether in the United States or out of it.

If the worst must come, let it come—he was not afraid of the consequences, in or out of the Union. Slavery will grow strong as time goes on.

When he entered Congress the Missouri Compromise excluded slavery from the Territories; now it is not excluded from a portion of land over which floats our national flag!

He alluded to the anti-slavery sentiment which prevailed in Virginia in the early days of the Commonwealth, and argued that it is useless to war against the progress of events. Every restriction has been taken off slavery; a Fugitive Slave law has been granted. There are more men at the North to-day who believe in the social and moral condition of slavery than when he went to Congress. Wilberforce's theory has failed; Carlyle has repudiated his Abolition doctrines; and even the London *Times* has partially kept up with him in his opinions. Freedom for the negro has been tried in the West India Islands and failed, and the defect is now attempted to be remedied by the introduction of Chinese coolies, under the title of "apprentices." They had better resort to the original state of things.

All, he continued, depends upon ourselves for the future. With our constitutional rights, and with the present principles of political policy, in his judgment, we are just as safe and even safer than we ever were. We must remain united; if we are ever divided, our day of doom will surely come. All nations, when they cease to grow, begin to die; we should, then, endeavor to expand and grow. Central America, Mexico, are all open to us. He does not believe that the country is large enough; but believes that a diversity of interests will strengthen the government better than if all were homogeneous. He looks forward in the future to the acquisition of Cuba; but was never in favor of paying Spain much money for it—not more than one or two millions of dollars. If Cuba wants to come into the Union, he would not ask Spain; but would be in favor of repealing the neutrality laws, so as to give our people a chance to help her in her wish.

He saw no reason why we should pay thirty millions for it; we have already spent several millions in preventing Americans from going to Cuba—and he wants the United States to quit holding the island while Spain skins it. (Cries of "Go on! go on!")

The best time to quit, resumed the speaker, is when nobody wants you to quit. What I have said about the principles of slavery is a new thing. Philosophers never thought much about a government founded on nature. All things now are slow in development, &c. He alluded to the theories of Copernicus, of Galileo, of Adam Smith, of Watts, of Newton, of Fulton; to the steamboat, the telegraph, &c.; all were slow in development, and the same principle will apply to our government.

He would now take his farewell leave. My race is done, said he, my career is ended—whether for good or evil, the record has been made up.

He would not say that he would never hold office under any emergency, for that would be insolent; but if any great emergency should arise, even if it were necessary to shoulder his musket in defence of his country—though he could not do much in that way—yet he would hold himself ready to obey the call of his country. But there was no office under Heaven which he would have in preference to that of Representative—and particularly from the Eight District.

In conclusion, he wishes peace, happiness and long life to all his hearers, prosperity to the country, and that our institutions might bless millions yet unborn, as they had blessed us.

Mr. Stephens sat down amid the applause of those who had the opportunity and the gratification to hear him.

ONCE FOR ALL.

From The Baltimore Christian Advocate.

To satisfy curiosity, to correct error, to contradict misstatement, to repel accusation, to take the point from insinuations and the poison from sneers, to confirm the friendly and disarm the inimical, to get honor for ourselves and put shame upon *Zion's Herald* and all its class, we do now declare and publish our reasons for not discussing the slavery question.

First: We do not discuss "the slavery question" because there is no slavery question to discuss. There is no proposition before the people of Maryland of Virginia to alter the relation at present existing between master and slave. If there be differences of opinion among individuals on that subject, they have not shaped themselves into projects, and therefore are not subjects for public consideration.

Secondly: Finding no question before the public in relation to slavery, we are not in condition to make one, because we have not formed any project upon the subject. We do not know what to advise our Legislature to do. We have been thinking more or less through life about it, and, further than approving of the colonization enterprise, we have come to no practical opinion as to how the evils attending the relations of whites and blacks are to be remedied. Therefore, as nobody else here has a project, and we have no project, we have nothing to discuss. Maryland and Virginia already acknowledge the advantage and propriety of African colonization, and it is not necessary to discuss that.

Thirdly: We do not discuss the question whether slavery is right or wrong, because there is no such question here. We are not a community hitherto without slavery, into which it is proposed to introduce it. In that case, the question of right or wrong would come up—a question which might not be of easy settlement either, for it could not be justly settled upon abstract principles. It was right to introduce slavery into the free Jewish State, for to do so was a great benevolence to the enslaved. It was wrong to bring *African* slaves here, for it was done *for* selfish purposes and through abominable means. But there is no question of that kind. We have to conduct ourselves with regard to slavery as with a fact, not a question. Whether we should make free men slaves is a very different and uncomplicated consideration compared with whether we shall make slaves free. The latter we have not before us. There is no movement here towards a general emancipation. Individuals do have that question submitted to them, but our paper is not the channel of communication between individuals. If any slaveholder wishes our advice on his particular question, he will probably ask for it from us as an individual.

As Methodists we have nothing to discuss concerning slavery. On that subject there is the most entire unanimity from the forks of the Susquehannah to the Rappahannock. Our people, with one consent, agree to the discipline as it is. It is a remarkable but delightful fact that, so far as we know, there does not exist in all this region any party who advocate change. Strange as it may seem to our Northern friends, there is no question to discuss among us upon this point.

At our quarterly meetings and camp meetings, our people meet together in unity, and the subject of slavery is not thought of. Nobody asks who is a master; nobody advocates a change of rule. We are satisfied with things as they are. We understood, when the great separation took place, that all who remained were to be satisfied with things as they are. We had confidence in our Northern brethren—we have confidence in them yet. We are satisfied that they will not alter the Discipline on this point without our consent. We will not argue with every schemer his project of change. We do not confound the wishes of a writer with the will of the Church. We are not deceived by the abuse of the official seal of the General Conference. We know how men get office and how little honor is to be expected from paid partisans, though they may claim much piety. We know that Christian conscience may be pleaded in defence of acts which heathen honesty would condemn, and that violations of all the precepts of Christ have, from time to time, been authorized by the functionaries of his religion. We believe in the honor and conscience and good sense of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and we are not disturbed by rumor of coming ruin. So we have no slavery measures to discuss. We want no change—we do not intend to have any—and we will discuss none. If we needed more reasons, we might add, it is useless for us to discuss these idle questions, because other Methodist papers do little else. If any of our people wish to read interminable articles about nonsensical propositions, they know where to find them. We print for those who do not. Surely those who wish to be relieved from the intolerable affliction of boundless twaddle ought to be permitted to have one humble paper and to read it in peace.

We trust that we have now defined our position clearly. If we have not made it intelligible to all, we think that the cause of confusion is not with us. It is certain that we have exhibited fairly the mind of our people on the matter.

Selections.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—OLD SCHOOL AND NEW.*

From The Free Church Portfolio.

THE OLD SCHOOL.

THIS is the largest of the Presbyterian sects in the United States. It embraces an immense amount of wealth in its membership, and great learning and talents in its ministry. It is well known that there always has been in this Church a large amount of anti-slavery sentiment. To crush it out, if possible, or at least to keep it in a state of innocent submission, has been, for years, the aim of the controlling power in the Church. And we must confess that more strategic skill has been shown in keeping the vexed question out of the debates of the General Assembly than was ever displayed by our National Congress in the same cause. There is only one way of explaining this fact. The great majority of the ministers of that Church have been educated on the charitable contributions of the people, made for this purpose. This has robbed them, in a great measure, of all independence of thought and action. Many of them know and feel that slavery is a system of crime that ought to be put out of the Church, and forever abolished. But they dare not give utterance to these convictions, either in the pulpit or the courts of the Church, lest they be accused by the leaders of ingratitude to the mother who has nursed them. As an illustration of this, an incident occurred during the late meeting of the General Assembly. Dr. Musgrave, who is Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions and a perfect fossilized old fogy, refused to commission a certain young man as a missionary to California who had been educated at the Princeton Seminary and licensed by one of the Presbyteries. When inquired of why he had treated the young man thus, he replied that there was something in his character so bad that he could not *mention it*. Dr. Van[illegible] Brooklyn, N. Y., investigated this matter and informed the Assembly that the fault in the character of the applicant was that he was an *Abolitionist!* Now, this young man in all probability was a *beneficiary*, taken from the humble walks of life and educated in the Academy, College and Theological Seminary at the expense of the Church. He was regarded by the leaders pretty much as the Russian government regards the young men who grow up in her foundling hospitals, as the *property* of the State. He therefore could bear snubbing. He would not dare to rebel. Dr. Musgrave knew his man, and consequently refused to send him to California and advised him to settle in *New Jersey!* The young licentiate is probably candidating through the vacancies of New Jersey according to order, where, if he procures a congregation, he will be compelled to smother down into perfect silence his anti-slavery convictions, and carry about with him the terrible consciousness of being a traitor to his God and a slave to his church. We know many of these men who have bartered away their independence for educational funds, and foreseeing the bondage to which they would be doomed, prepared for the worst and shaped their course accordingly. All these men, and they are numbered by hundreds in the Old School Church, are *controlled* in Synods and General Assemblies and made to do the bidding of their benefactors and almoners. Should an anti-slavery man rise in the General Assembly to give utterance to the sentiments that are agitating his heart, a look from the Secretary of the Board of Education, and a significant pointing of his finger to some roll of the beneficiaries where his name stands opposite the sum total he has received from the charity of the Church, soon bring him up to his seat, overwhelmed with emotions of a peculiar kind. There always have been some noble sons of God who never could be purchased to a certain line of policy by Church benefactions. They never wore collars on their necks with this inscription, "*The property of the Presbyterian Church, Old School.*" But these men have been *raræ aves in terris.* The great majority of beneficiaries are owned by the Church as a bale of cotton is owned by a Philadelphia merchant. Hence the leaders who control her policy are enabled to avert the anti-slavery storm which otherwise would rage in the General Assembly as it has in the National Congress.

There are three classes of men in the Old School Church. 1. The Anti-Slavery men, who honestly believe the testimony of 1818, that slavery is a sin, and ought to be put out of the communion of the Church. 2. The pro-slavery men, headed by Dr. Adger and Dr. Thornwell of South Carolina, who pretend to believe that slavery is right and a Bible institution, a blessing to the master and a still greater blessing to the slave. This class are mortified and chafed at the idea that they, as slaveholders, are only "tolerated" in the Church. They reason logically and say that if slavery is a *sin*, as declared in the testimony of 1818, and by most Christians in the North, then it ought not to be allowed a place in the Church at all, but should be given up immediately, with repentance towards God for its remission. For if the Church connives at *one sin*, and tolerates its existence in her membership, she may connive at *all* sin, and thus make the house of God a den of thieves. We admire the high-mindedness of this class of men. We like their spunk in refusing to be *tolerated* in the Church as weak or tempted transgressors. The Pope often grants a "dispensation" to Catholics to do what would otherwise be a mortal sin, but a Presbyterian General Assembly has never yet, *in so many words*, given permission to commit "a gross violation of the law of God," as slavery is defined to be in her testimony. And yet, *practically*, such an "indulgence" as this is offered to Southern slaveholders to commit sin! We do not wonder that our old friend Dr. Adger, being a Protestant as he is, and rejecting the popish doctrine of indulgences, should vehemently oppose the idea of slaveholders, being tolerated in the Church as unconvicted and unpunished criminals. Neither do we wonder at Mr. Spratt and others of the same class who demand of Congress the repeal of the law forbidding the slave trade and pronouncing it piracy. For if slavery is right, and the traffic in slaves among the slave States right also, the slave *trade* on the coast of Africa *cannot be wrong.* If we were a slaveholder, we would take the highest ground and stand beside Dr. Adger, Mr. Spratt and John Mitchel, and contend for the legality and Christianity of the slave trade as well as slavery. The idea of being "*tolerated*," either in the Confederacy or the Church, is not to be tolerated by any right-minded man who has proper self-respect and an appreciation of his own rights. The third class in the Old School are the *Hunkers*, who have not one particle either of heart or of conscience in regard to the wrongs of the slave, but who are eaten up and consumed of the spirit of Church extension and aggrandizement. In the many offices of the Church are snug berths, rich pickings, and places of influence. The enjoyment of these depends upon the *union* and *peace* of the body, and hence the slavery question, which is a distracting question, is avoided as a leprosy. This class believe in the testimony of 1818 and in that of 1845, that is, that slavery and anti-slavery are both right, and both wrong, and both tend to infidelity. The hunkers are chameleons. They take their hue from surrounding objects. In the South they are Southern, and in the North they are Northern. They believe a great many things, but the proposition they believe with *all their heart* is that the slavery subject, which is a political subject, should never be alluded to either in pulpit, Presbytery, Synod or Assembly, because it will disturb the peace and welfare of "our beloved Zion."

This class is headed by Dr. Rice of Chicago, who proved himself at the last General Assembly to be the Autocrat of the Presbyterian Church. Surrounded by his trained bands and attaches, he has made war upon the anti-slavery party, headed by Drs. M'Masters and Thomas, and completely crushed it for the time being. The project of the North-West Seminary originated with the anti-slavery party, who, with the best motives, designed to have *one* institution in the great North-West, where should be inculated upon theological students who were to be the future pastors of the Churches the doctrines of the testimony of 1818. Dr. Thomas first, and Dr. M'Master afterwards, both expressed, in the bitterest language, their hostility to the action of 1845, of which Dr. Rice was the author. The place designated for this new Seminary was Chicago. The funds of New Albany were to go there and the institution was to be under the care of Synods of the North-West instead of the General Assembly. Drs. M'Master and Thomas, two men as finished scholars and as well fitted for their posts as the Church could produce, were to be continued as Professors. But in the midst of the execution of these plans, Dr. Rice, who was located at St. Louis, gets himself called to Chicago, and there begins the work of checkmating. He succeeds in frustrating the plans of the New Albany men, taking the contemplated Seminary out of the hands of the Synods and putting it under the care of the General Assembly, inducing Mr. M'Cormick of Chicago to give $100,000 towards the endowment of the Seminary, provided it be located at that point, and winds up the stratagem by procuring his own election to the most important chair in the theological Faculty of the Seminary! Thus he routed the anti-slavery forces by a perfect Waterloo defeat—horse, foot and dragoons, all gone! In the election of professors, poor Dr. Thomas's name was not even mentioned, Dr. M'Master received scarcely what the politicians call a *complimentary vote*, and all the men elected to the professorships, with the exception of Dr. Rice, unknown to fame, and one at least run into the dry dock of a professorship because he could not weather the tempestuous seas of Brooklyn. We know of nothing in modern times equal to the stratagem of Dr. Rice, except the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon in becoming Emperor of France. There were Dr. Moutfort, and Dr. Stanton, and we know not how many others of the same way of thinking, who all licked the dust as Dr. Rice's triumphal car passed over their sore toes, and, for the sake of the "peace and welfare of our beloved Zion," exclaimed, faintly, to be sure, *Io Triumphe.*

Before the vote was taken, however, which settled the question, Dr. M'Master delivered a speech of more than two hours' length, in which he showed up the design of the Slave Power in subjugating the Church by this movement. We need scarcely say it was an able production, for Dr. M'Master is one of the most finished scholars in the whole body. Educated in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, he understands the slavery question fully and believes in the sinfulness of the system. He is an independent thinker and speaker. He owes no *debt* to the Presbyterian Church, either pecuniary or otherwise, as was the case probably with at least two-thirds of the ministry in the late Assembly. His learning and talents made him an acquisition to the Old School, and hence he is as yet an unsubdued freeman. He has found by this time, however, that a man with an old fashioned anti-slavery conscience has a hard road to travel in a Church ruled by the Slave Power with a rod of iron.

Dr. M'Master's speech contains revelations of things *past* as well as things *to come.* It gives a history of the North-West Seminary which justifies all we have said, and more, as to the "impudent domination" of the Slave Power in the affairs of the Old School Church. In an appendix, added to the speech since the adjournment of the Assembly, are statements which are well calculated to [illegible] show them the depth of their degradation. We would publish this speech, with the appendix, as an important part of the *res gestæ* of the great struggle in which we are engaged, but our limits will not allow us. If any of our readers wish to procure the document, they can do so by sending a shilling to the "Office of *The Presbyter*," Cincinnati.

Although it may seem paradoxical, we nevertheless rejoice at the doings of 1859, and regard them, upon the whole, as hopeful. The depotism of the dominant party has been so crushing and grinding that it will either exterminate altogether the anti-slavery sentiment, and make the Presbyterian Church the acknowledged tool of the Slave Power, or it will rouse up the self-respect and energy of the minority, and make them fight like Trojans against the perfidious Greeks. The whole country will look and wait to see whether the old Calvinistic love of liberty and equal rights will succumb before the Slave Power, incarnated in the person and shadowed forth in the policy of Dr. Nathan Rice. We are much mistaken if the inevitable crisis is not hastened by the events of 1859. We say the inevitable crisis, for there is nothing surer than that the Old School must meet the slavery question and decide it. If the anti slavery men can revolutionize the sentiment and purge out the heresy and the crime of slaveholding without division, we shall rejoice. We have many dear friends in the Old School Church. We have many warm affections for her. We never left her communion because we hated her people or her polity. We hated slavery with intense devotion. We loved liberty and free speech above all price; and as the Church wedded herself to slavery, we were forced, as an honest Presbyterian of the stripe of 1818, to withdraw from her pale—not that we loved Cæsar less, but that we loved Rome more. Nothing in this world would rejoice our heart more than to see the Old School Presbyterian Church taking the right position on the great question of the age, throwing overboard the piratical crew which have usurped command, and directing her guns once more upon the enemy instead of her true sons and her ancient glory.

THE NEW SCHOOL.

The New School Assembly convened this year at Wilmington, Delaware. Our readers are aware that, ever since the disruption in 1837, each body claims to be *the* Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The New School is by far the smaller body of the two and makes no such progress in Church extension as the Old School. * * * Their standards, word for word, are the same as those of the Old School. And even on the slavery subject there is no practical difference. Both bodies have the testimony of 1818 and both treat it as a nullity. The Old School, in 1845, openly declared slavery to be no bar to Christian communion, thus virtually repealing the testimony. The New School practically set it aside by admitting slaveholders to communion. On the roll of the late General Assembly were the names of the Synods and Presbyteries which went off in the Ross and Netherland stampede at Cleveland. Had they all come back with their slaves and slavery defences, they would have been received with open arms. With the exception of Albert Barnes, we know of no man in the New School who has the reputation of being an anti-slavery man. In this respect they are far below the Old School. The Old School have Dr. M'Master, Dr. Thomas, the younger Fullerton and a host of others who are outspoken men. But who in the New School will answer to these? In the parlor, the New School men claim to be good anti-slavery men. But they are anti-slavery men after the order of Saint Nicodemus. You might listen to their preaching and their prayers for many a long year without ever dreaming that there were four million of slaves in the United States living and dying like heathens. There is no practical difference, therefore, between the two schools on this vital point. The Ross faction would be received into the Old School without a word, and they would be received back again into the New School with tears of joy.

We say, again, the New School have no distinctive character, no individuality. There is not room even in this large country for two sects with the same identical confession of faith and form of government and the same position substantially upon the slavery question. Hence there is a constant going over from the New to the Old School of ministers and Churches, but none from the Old School to the New. What does a minister or Church gain by remaining with the New School? What do they lose by connection with the Old School? The New School have Seminaries and Colleges, and some other property in the shape of vested funds, which constitute a much stronger bond of union among them than anything else. Were it not for this, they would go to pieces in a few years, one part going off to the Congregationalists, the other to the Old School. The men who were engaged in the controversy in the Presbyterian Church which terminated in the division of 1837 are still very bitter in their hostility to each other, and would oppose a reunion. But these men will soon go the way of all the earth, and then another generation will arise who will not know the Josephs that flourished in the old controversy. These will coalesce. A transfer of funds will take place and the schism will be healed. Already the young men of both Churches, who have recently come upon the stage, and who feel none of the asperity which marked the old combatants, are exchanging pulpits with each other, and communing with each other, and see no reason why what is local in this respect should not be universal.

The only measure the New School could have adopted to perpetuate their existence as a sect was to have taken the hint, and availed themselves of the occasion given them by that almost miraculous providence which, at Cleveland, delivered them from the dead weight of the slaveholding Churches. Had they then thanked God for the deliverance and proclaimed with trumpet-tongue through the land that henceforth the New School Presbyterian Church was to be an anti-slavery body, holding no communion with slaveholders, and offering an anti-slavery gospel to the South, there would have been an uprising of the people in her favor, which would have strengthened her foundations amazingly. Then, instead of the stream of refugees which is moving from the New to the Old School, the tide would have been turned, and the anti-slavery ministers and Churches of the Old School would have sought a refuge in the New School. If it be asked, why such Churches do not find a home in the Free Synod, we reply that we are a small body. We have no Seminaries, no well endowed Colleges and no vested funds. Many a man who is not anti-slavery enough to come to the Free Synod is too much so to remain in a slaveholding Church, when, without too great sacrifices, he could step over to a body so well endowed as the New School is.

It is known to our readers that, at the suggestion of certain New School brethren who desired the Free Presbyterians to unite with them, an overture was sent by the Free Synod to the late General Assembly, proposing terms of union. This document was laid before the Committee of Bills, on whose recommendation it was committed to a special committee to report such action as seemed suitable and wise. But such was the fearfulness of one part, and the indifference of the other, and the entire hunkerism of both, that the overture was smothered to death and never saw the light. Common courtesy demanded that this special committee should recommend that the paper which was *addressed* to the *General Assembly should be read* to the *Assembly*, and, upon the reading thereof, let any action take place that might be deemed best. But the Assembly knew nothing of the overture. The reporters knew nothing of it. And yet we are informed that a committee was appointed to attend the next meeting of the Free Synod—for what? to talk in the name of the Assembly of a matter which the Assembly knew nothing about, because the paper containing the subject, and which was addressed to the Assembly, was never presented to that body, but remains to this day in the breeches pocket of the chairman of the special committee. We leave it to any gentleman, layman or clergyman, Christian or worldly politician, North or South, to say whether this conduct on the part of the men concerned in it was not dishonorable in the extreme? Had it been a *petition* to the General Assembly, it would have been an outrage to suppress it. Even Congress, years ago, in the dark days of the struggle, *listened* to petitions, if it never answered them. But this was a fraternal letter from one ecclesiastical body to another, containing an important proposition in regard to a great question of religion and morality, and yet it was smothered in the dark by these men, thus insulting the body from which it came, and treating the General Assembly as a weak hysterical old woman who could not digest her own food! To our amazement, Dr. Kendall, of Pittsburgh, who had more to do in getting up this overture than any other man, and who was a member of the special committee into whose hands it was put, never insisted that, inasmuch as the paper was addressed to the *General Assembly*, and not to a special committee, it ought to be read to the Assembly. He was concerned, with the rest of the gentlemen, in the act of suppressing the paper, and yet is one of the committee to visit the Free Synod at its next meeting, to *further the negotiation*, we presume! We shall have a number of searching questions to propose to the Doctor on this matter, when he comes.

We could not say with any degree of honesty that we are surprised at all this. The New School Church, although it now has very few slaveholders in its communion, since the general jail delivery that took place at Cleveland, is quite as bunkerish, in our opinion, as the Old School. [illegible] she was much [illegible] sent our overture to the Old School, proposing to *put* the slaveholders out of the Church, as we proposed to the New School to keep them out when they had gone, the Assembly would not have read the document addressed to them, and, after discussion, appointed a special committee to report action on the proposal. We have an idea that the Old School men understand the rules of common decency which regulate the conduct of bodies in their fraternal intercourse with each other, and would at least have given a polite hearing to those who addressed them. But no, we will not say that the New School brethren are strangers to all *etiquette.* They do understand it. But their whole course in regard to this overture, so cowardly and disgraceful as it was, was explained by a remark made privately by one of the members of the Assembly who had seen the paper. "Sir, the overture is iron-linked in argument from beginning to end. From the premises of 1818, it travels on to the conclusion that slaveholders should be kept out of the Church as relentlessly as death follows its victim to the grave. But, we cannot take any higher ground than we occupy without endangering our peace, if not our existence."

The *Central Christian Herald*, in an article published in the same number that contained our overture and on the subject matter of that document, admits that if, at the time of the disruption in 1837, the New School had taken the advice of John Rankin and others to cut loose from slavery altogether, they would by this time have been a large, sound and popular body, superior in numbers, influence and standing to the Old School. Yet, in the face of this admission, the writer, who, we suspect, was a Lane Seminary Professor, is opposed to the Assembly complying with the proposition in the overture, because, among other reasons, it was necessary to submit the matter to the *Presbyteries*, to be *decided by them!* Did the Assembly of 1818 overture the Presbyteries before they adopted the action of that year?

The Free Presbyterians and all the rest of the country can see, in the reception given to the overture, how empty are the claims of the New School Church to be an anti-slavery body. From what we hear, there are not probably a baker's dozen of slaveholders in the whole Church. And yet, with the rising flood of anti-slavery sentiment in the political world to sustain and cheer them—with no such motive to favor slavery as the Old School have in the fact that there are hundreds of slaveholders in communion whose feelings are to be respected—in the very face and teeth of the leadings of Providence giving them riddance of slavery, they refuse to shut the door against the evil, but keep it wide open and beckon the absconding slaveholders back! Suppose the Free Presbyterians should be fools enough to connect with the New School on their present basis, it might not be five years before slavery, like the serpent in the garden of Eden, would glide into the enclosure of the Church and make another secession necessary. We have contended too long and at too much expense for our principles to give them up for such a mess of pottage as the New School offer us. No, with all the disadvantages and discouragements of our present position, we should rather occupy it to the end of our days than go up to the judgment seat of the Living God with the blood of the slaveholder and the slave on our skirts. Christianity is a delusion and a fable, or else it is our duty to reprove the slaveholding brother for his sin, and testify against it, in the name of God, for his sake as well as the sake of his victim. *Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor and not suffer sin on him*, is the language of the Almighty. Do either the New School or the Old heed this admonition? In their testimony they say that slavery is a sin; yet, in their refusal to rebuke the perpetrator of the sin, they are guilty of blotting out the eternal distinction between right and wrong, and saying that good is evil and evil is good. How can they meet their Southern brethren in the great day of the revelation of Jesus Christ, when they have allowed a damning sin to fasten itself upon their characters without rebuke, and thus deface the image of Jesus Christ. This is the reason why we loathe hunkerism so intensely. It has a marble heart. It has a gum-elastic conscience. It would not shed one tear, nor betray a single emotion, if the whole of the four millions of slaves, with all their masters, cuts de of "our Church," should be swallowed up by an earthquake and go quickly down to everlasting burnings. For the sake of *peace*, when Jesus Christ says he "came not to bring peace on the earth, but a sword," for the sake of popularity, and place, and fat salaries, it allows crime to rankle and fester in the very bosom of the Church till it becomes thoroughly diseased and enfeebled. We Free Presbyterians have clean hands now, so far as participation in this great iniquity is concerned. Let us keep them so. The duty of the Free Presbyterian Church is plain, in our judgment. It is to stand in her lot, bearing her testimony against the great sin of our day and cherishing among her members the sentiments of love and confidence, and holding herself in readiness for any duty which may be indicated by the providence of God. We are too small a body to fall out by the way, or to carry the dead weight of even a few injudicious and foolish men. We owe it to ourselves as ministers, and to our people who stand with us as testimony bearers, to be united and firm in our adherence to those great principles which we have espoused as a reformed Church. These principles are spreading all over the land, and, being right, must ultimately prevail.

* The writer of this sketch, the Rev. ARTHUR B. BRADFORD, of Newcastle, Pa., is thoroughly familiar with his subject, and his statements are worthy of entire credence.—*Ed. Standard.*

THE METHODIST CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

AN APPEAL

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE GREAT METHODIST FAMILY, AFFILIATING WITH THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

Beloved Brethren in Christ:

THE undersigned, ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, would respectfully represent:

That, at an early day in our history as a Church, slaveholders were tolerated among us as members—that the practice had become so common that, in 1844, one of our bishops was found to be a slaveholder—that a resolution requesting him not to officiate as a bishop till that impediment was removed caused a division of the original Methodist Episcopal Church in 1845; and that, notwithstanding that division, the Methodist Episcopal Church (that is, the Northern Division of the original Church) is still deeply involved in the sin and shame of slaveholding. We have thousands of slaveholders yet in the Church—trustees, stewards, leaders, and local preachers, and even travelling preachers have become slaveholders in several instances, and are such still, with but little disapprobation, as a general thing, on the part of the Conferences to which they belong. Such is our present connection with this terrible crime against humanity.

The undersigned, and tens of thousands in the private membership of our Church, feel that these things are wrong in the sight of God—a disgrace to Methodism and our common Christianity, and a stumbling-block to unbelievers. We, therefore, feel that

is a low sagacity for its own reputation; a putrid light, like that which shines in rotten wood, only when every element of vitality has departed; a mean, cringing fear of man's judgment, without any desire to please God, or any conscientious hatred of the sin, which he has made even the conscience of the world to reprobate! No wonder that the same leaders of the Church, and expounders of its piety, have been known to declare that if by a single prayer they could at once emancipate all the slaves, they would not do it! Thus is the Church dead in this trespass and this sin; and while the world are ashamed of it, the Church glory in their shame; the Church accept of the system of slavery as it is, and will not suffer a word against it. No man loses standing or reputation for pro-slavery sentiments; but the moment any one is known to be thoroughly opposed to slavery, and determined to proclaim God's Word against it, forthwith, for that very cause alone, he is marked as a fanatic, is accused of being destitute of the spirit of Christ, is shut out from the pulpit, is ostracized, as far as possible, from Christian society and influence.

The men who have been the leaders in the base, corrupting, dissimulating policy and career of the Tract Society, so fatal to all good morals, so destructive of integrity, so debauching to the conscience of the nation, hold their pretensions to piety as high and unimpeached as ever, and the Churches trust in them with the same confidence, as if they had not avowed principles of conduct that would sanction every breach of trust, and making lying itself a virtue. It would seem as if no extreme of degradation before the Slave Power, not the most cringing obedience to its edicts, not the most palpable fellowship of slavery and friendship for it, not the most willing endurance of its abominations, not the most perfect insensibility and hard-heartedness toward the slave, and sympathy with the oppressor, could impeach the piety of these gentlemen; as if this branch of morals really had nothing to do with piety, as if a man could be just as good a Christian in every respect, and yet favor slavery, protect it, sanction it, practise it, as if he abhorred its cruelties, and set himself against it. Nay, the favoring of slavery, the careful avoidance of all sentiment, opinion, and speech against it, the fellowship of slaveholders, and the abuse of abolitionists, are rather regarded as marks of peculiar eminence in piety, growth in grace, savoring of unction, and very commendatory to the favor of the Church. The apology for slavery, the keeping out of the "slavery agitation," the exclusion of such agitation from the pulpit and the Church, the defence of slavery against those who pronounce it, in the name of God, sinful and only sinful continually—all these elements of policy are looked upon as the essence and richness of a conservative piety. A man that can keep the subject of slavery out of his church, and propose a missionary hallelujah because God will overrule even WAR and the SLAVERY AGITATION for the advancement of the missionary cause, so that the saints need not fear because some people are striving to make a noise about slaveholding being permitted in the Churches, is a man whose conservative piety and wisdom cannot be doubted.

But the man that agitates against slavery, you must beware of him, you must set the mark of the beast upon him, you must denounce him as destitute both of judgment and of the spirit of love, you must cast him out, and publish a warning against him. The man that you discover to be really, truly, honestly, resolutely moving, and determined to move others, for the excommunication of slavery from the Churches, and the array of the Churches against slavery, him you must excommunicate as swiftly and cunningly as possible. For this agitation of slavery and opposition against it are a leprosy, a pestilence, to be at all hazards avoided; and if men cannot be cured of it, then they must be ecclesiastically burned.—*Dr. Cheever, in The Independent.*

But it is an offence which the lofty morality and high virtue of this model republic cannot away with.

So with regard to the sympathy which is so evident in all the high places of rule in the land, at the North as well as in the South, with the tyrannies of Europe. There is no traveller so swift to humble himself at the foot of the throne of Bonaparte or of Bomba as your flaming American Democrat. There is no one so ready to echo the tyrant's plea of necessity to excuse the basest and blackest deeds as he, or so prompt to deny the fitness of any nation but his own for the charge of its own affairs. The morals and the political economy of the plantation are applied to the down-trodden peoples; and as it is taken for granted that slavery has made the slaves unfit for freedom, so it is argued that despotism has made its continuance necessary by the very degradation it has occasioned. The National public sentiment of the Great American Republic is on the side of the despot and not of the martyr for liberty. Even the interest and admiration which the Italian expedition of Bonaparte has excited is more from the energy of will and grasp of material forces which it has enabled him to exhibit than from any belief in his mission of liberty. Should he reëstablish the old tyrannies, or set up worse in their stead, it may redound to his credit for political wisdom, but in no degree to his disgrace for treachery and villany. We are accustomed to extend the Area of Freedom much in the same kind of way, and on the same sort of pretences. An American minister, of the straightest sect, writes up the elder Bonaparte as a hero, a sage and a saint, and sees nothing to rebuke in the basenesses, the treacheries, the cruelties, the carnage, in which he founded and by which he built up his greatness. The same reverend man lays his book as an offering at the feet of the bastard usurper who now is named by his name, and glories in the condescension and notice accorded to him. Now, such politicians and such priests as these are the natural and necessary product of our soil, cursed and blighted as it is by the withering, dwarfing, distorting influences of slavery. Such men as these are the noble growth our soil supplies, and these are the kind of souls ripened in our Northern skies.

Now, we will not absolutely affirm that all our bad manners and bad morals spring from the existence of slavery. Though no man may have spit in England, as Sydney Smith said, since the Heptarchy, the institution of exsalivation is by no means unknown on the continent of Europe, and the smoking nuisance is worse there than here—for it is at least kept out of our railway carriages. American travellers at home are not the only monsters that bolt their food whole and sit with their feet higher than their heads. Ill breeding is of no clime and of no race. But the deeper vices of the American character, our tolerance, not to say encouragement, of crimes of violence against the person, the contrivances of our laws to suffer the rich to escape and to make amends by the exemplary punishment of the poor sinner, the time-serving and compromising spirit, above all, which is eating out the life of the American soul, the readiness of the band of violence in personal quarrel and its slackness for the maintenance of assaulted rights, all these things may be justly traced in large measure to the despotism which has organized itself into our Republic. These are all of them the vices of slaves, of human beings under the irresponsible control of human beings, and they crop out wherever that abnormal condition of things exists, whether on a South Carolina plantation, in the Senate of Bonaparte at Paris, in the Congress of the United States, in Ecclesiastical Convention, Board or Pulpit, or in the headlong struggles of the Republican party after the Will o' the Wisp that lures them into so many bogs and quagmires, and may lead to their final dispersion and disappearance. It is the long habit of obedience to the word of command that disarms resistance and erects a poor capitulation into a political virtue. Herodotus tells a story of an army of revolted slaves who were thrown into confusion and brought to unconditional surrender, simply by their masters rushing at them, brandishing their slave-whips. The habit of subordination and sight of the magic emblem of mastership and slavehood were too much for the new spirit of liberty, or even of the instinct of self defence, to contend against.

Now, it is only occasionally that the actual symbol of slavery is brought into play, as in the attempted assassination of Senator Sumner, but the thing it signifies is everywhere. It was to be seen in the long, thin forefinger with which Mr. Clay conjured the soul out of the body of Rufus Choate. It was to be heard in the shrill Epicene notes of John Randolph's voice when his insolence cowed Northern tongues into silence; its crack brings rebellious Congressmen to their senses, and its mere wind inspires the deliberations and informs the decisions of the American Board and the American Tract Society. Its power is omnipresent and all but omnipotent. As soon as a political party gets near enough to the White House to get sight of it, it seems as if the shadow of those slavery-saturated walls fell upon their souls and darkened all their counsels. Hence the multitudinous shortcomings of the Republican party. The leaders are led, as they think—misled, as we esteem it—by the supposed necessity of conciliating the large class of minds who are in bondage to slavery and the false presentiments and blear illusions which go before and follow her. No victory can be got in this way, or none that will not be worse than a defeat. They have not been taught the wisdom of courage and faith by the political history of the country. That history has been merely the record of factions struggling for power, and trying to see which could make the most servile concessions to the Slave Power as the price of it. The Fremont campaign was more a real than an apparent exception—which is not a common case. The leaders pared down the anti-slavery principles of the party to a fineness compared with which the spider's most attenuated thread was cord and cable with a witness. And yet the masses, both North and South, would insist upon regarding it as an anti-slavery contest and Fremont as the champion of the slave. Hence his success, which was only defeated by fraudulent returns. And yet, in the face of this experience, the leaders of the Republicans seem to think that the withdrawing of yet more of the Anti-Slavery element is what is wanted to ensure them success! We prophesy their utter defeat, unless they make their issue a clear and unmistakable one of Slavery and Anti-Slavery—of North and South. When they, or another party taking their place, are ready to take that ground, we will guarantee a victory. For, notwithstanding all we have said about the corruption slavery has worked in American blood, there is yet soundness enough left to work itself clear of the disease, if it be given a chance. But that part of our subject must bide its time.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1859.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

Anniversary of West India Emancipation.

THE usual "First of August" Anniversary will be celebrated, this year, on SATURDAY, July 30th, in the beautiful ISLAND GROVE, at NORTH ABINGTON.

The liberation of EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND slaves by the government under which they were held is an act of disinterested philanthropy, as uncommon in human legislation as it is full of righteous rebuke and touching appeal to this slaveholding Republic.

Let the friends of Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation gather from every quarter, to bear anew their testimony against a Government deaf to the cry of the victims of its relentless tyranny, and a Church by its connivance, consent and complicity; these millions of the Israel of God are held in chains; to redeemed their "lives and fortunes" to the redemption of "the suffering and the dumb" of our land, and hasten the day when they, too, shall be brought forth from the ineffable misery of bondage, to be compassed about with the songs of deliverance.

An able corps of eloquent speakers will be present to address the meeting. The fare upon the Railroads will be reduced as usual. (Further particulars next week.)

In behalf of the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, FRANCIS JACKSON, *President.*

ROBERT F. WALLCUT, *Secretary.*

☞ We understand that our unwearied and ever faithful coadjutors at HOPEDALE, with their friends in that vicinity, will, as usual, celebrate the anniversary of West India Emancipation, by a Grand Mass Meeting in the spacious Town Hall of MILFORD, on MONDAY, August 1.

THE TREE AND ITS FRUITS.

THE thinness of the American cuticle has grown into a proverb. As a correspondent of this paper said, years ago *apropos* to a Boston bully who shrunk from the touch of criticism, Marsyas, after he had been flayed by Apollo, was a pachydermatous animal in the comparison. The impertinence of foreign comment on the conversion of the Universe into a vast spittoon, on the miracle whereby chairs which are quadrupedal by nature are transformed into bipeds by the sitting-down of an American, on the magic celerity with which the Yankees eat, and the preternatural length at which they talk, is a thing "most tolerable and not to be endured." But it is only foreign ridicule of the external demonstrations of the semi-barbarism of American life and society that arouses the indignant denial or the sharp retort. The armed rhinoceros is not more callous to a pigmy's straw than is the American nature to the great central barbarism and the atrocities that immediately grow out of it. Slavery at which all Civilization, and almost all Savagedom, lifts up its eyes in abhorrence, is defended with fronts blazing with brass and tongues dropping venom. And the Brooksisms and the Sicklesisms, the mobs and the murders, the lynchings and the robberies which attend upon her state share with her in the immunity which belongs of right to a Sovereign who can do no wrong. And this confusion of the moralities and of the decencies is by no means limited by the boundary which is supposed to be the frontier of the Slave kingdom. As the manners of a Court infect or purify those of the remoter dependencies of the empire over which it is predominant, so the code of honor and of ethics of our dominant authority extends its sway far from the actual place of its throne.

We cannot wonder, then, at the description given in a recent letter by our London Correspondent, Mrs. Harriet Martineau, of the effect produced in civilized bosoms in England, and on the continent besides, by the Key murder. That Sickles should have murdered Key in the cowardly and cruel manner he did, was not a thing to excite great astonishment, for the Newgate Calendar is not without examples of this kind. But that he should be saluted as a hero, not to say a saint, in virtue of his deed was a consequence that could scarcely have occurred to the phlegmatic imagination of John Bull as among the remotest of possibilities. And when this state of morbid feeling was not confined to the Slave country, but broke forth flagrantly in this city and sporadically over the whole Northern country, he might well thank his stars that these descendants of his had taken their portion and gone into a far country, from the husks of which there was small danger of their ever returning to claim his blessing and a farther slice of his estate. If anything could increase his amazement at the new forms which old moralities assume in new worlds, it will be the intelligence of the way in which the reconciliation of Sickles and his wife has affected the sensibilities of his friends and the general public. His revenge upon his enemy, though inflicted in a way so cowardly and so cruel, was virtue and magnanimity, which half emptied New York of her Old Bailey lawyers to vindicate it into a precedent; but his forgiveness of his sinning wife and his restoration of her to her place by his side makes the fine gold dim of his great name, and sinks him beneath the notice of his chiefest friends and admirers. To us the match appears an excellent one—not, perhaps, exactly made in Heaven, which is not probably the precise place where the conjunctions of murderers and prostitutes are arranged, but one in which congenial natures are united and made one.

GALL OF THE INDEPENDENT.

The Independent has been discussing, of late, the claims of the Southern Aid Society, with its Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Stiles. The Doctor having, in the course of his argument, remarked that the testimony of Dr. (Southside) Adams and others to the favorable religious condition of the slaves was rendered in answer to the following question, "constantly propounded by a popular sentiment" at the North, viz., "Are not almost all masters at the South uncivilized brutes, utterly devoid of generous sympathy with their slaves, and accustomed to press their own selfish ends through the grossest neglect and abuse of their dependents on every hand?" *The Independent* thus replies:

"We will venture to correct our brother's statement of the question which, he says, 'is constantly propounded by a popular sentiment in this latitude.' While we admit that he ought to know better than we can know what the facts are at the South, and what opinions are current there, we profess to know as much as he about the popular sentiment of the North. He will allow us to affirm, as of our own knowledge, that the question 'Are not almost all masters at the South uncivilized brutes,' etc., is not propounded by any popular sentiment in this latitude. *The troop of performers, male and female (including some men of high culture, and of great but unbalanced genius), which amuses the public with yearly exhibitions in New York and Boston, and in some inland cities like Worcester and Syracuse, may seem not only to propound the question, but to answer it in the affirmative; but the glory of those performers, and that which gives piquancy to all their exhibitions, is that the popular sentiment is against them.* The sentiment, however unreflected, of such persons, denouncing as they do not only the American Board of Foreign Missions and the American Home Missionary Society, but the evangelical ministry and Churches of all the Northern States, with a vehemence of rhetoric that leaves them little breath to expend in condemnation of the South, is not to be confounded with that popular sentiment in this latitude which demands the universal abolition of slavery."

The priestly defamer who penned the words which we have italicized above knows, of course, that the class of persons whom he stigmatizes as a "troop of performers, male and female," have never propounded, either in spirit or fact, any such question as that which Dr. Stiles puts in the mouths of anti-slavery men at the North; but in defending himself and his associates, he could not resist the temptation to malign those whose faithful labors have made it necessary for him to assume an anti-slavery garb.

It must seem strange to those who are not familiar with the history of the anti-slavery enterprise that *The Independent*, which professes to be an anti-slavery journal, and whose owner coins money out of the reputation of Henry Ward Beecher, Mrs. Stowe and Dr. Cheever, should constantly treat the American Anti-Slavery Society and its friends with an unscrupulous malignity akin to the spirit of Bennett's *Herald* and the *Observer*. The matter, however, is easily explained. Of the three or four Doctors of Divinity who preside over that paper, *one* was implicated in the clandestine and eminently dishonorable sale of *The Emancipator*, the American Anti Slavery Society's organ, in 1840, and of course *he* can never forgive the Society for successfully parrying the treacherous blow which he aimed at its life. The hostility of another is intensified by the remembrance of old controversies with this Society and its friends, in which he bore a dishonorable part, and out of which he came defeated and crest-fallen. We allude to the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D.D., of New Haven. When Garrison first startled the drowsy North with the demand for "immediate emancipation," saying, "I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—and I WILL BE HEARD," Dr. Bacon, then a popular writer, ambitious of leadership in the Church, essayed to win a name by resisting and defeating the movement of the young champion of liberty. He stood forth the advocate of gradualism, the defender of the Colonization Society, the apologist of slavery. Foremost was he among those who set up against the Abolitionists the cry of "fanaticism," "incendiarism," "amalgamation," etc., and who, by the incessant reiteration of the vilest misrepresentations and slanders, aroused a spirit of mobocracy which for years made it hazardous to property and life to hold an anti-slavery meeting even in New England. A leading champion of the Colonization scheme, he was in open league with the men who, under the influence of the diabolical spirit of caste, procured the enactment of a law making it a penal offence to receive into any school in Connecticut a colored pupil from another State—a law under which Prudence Crandall, a noble, self-sacrificing Christian woman, was thrust into jail, her school broken up and her property sacrificed, and which was indeed enacted for the very purpose of bringing about that result. Finding, after awhile, that his efforts to crush the young giant of Anti-Slavery were bootless, and that the movement against which he had set himself in such inconsiderate zeal was making rapid progress, and must inevitably succeed, he then essayed to ride the rising anti-slavery tide to turn the ecclesiastical mills, and, as a means to this end, to crowd out the faithful laborers in the cause upon the plea of "ultraism," "infidelity," etc., and foist himself and his associates into their places, as "prudent" men and friends of the Church! He long since ceased to defend the Colonization Society, but he has never made honorable confession of his sin in supporting it, and his later course shows that he has never forgiven those who beat him in argument and compelled him, from a prudent regard for his reputation, to change his course, if not his principles. There can be no doubt, we suppose, that the mendacious editorial paragraph that appeared in *The Independent* two or three years ago, in which Mr. Garrison was spoken of as "AN INFIDEL OF THE MOST DEGRADED CLASS," and which, though the evidence of its falsity was brought home to the editors with unmistakable force and clearness, has never been contradicted, was penned by this clerical maligner. The paragraph quoted above doubtless proceeded from the same unprincipled source.

IS JUDGE SWAN A REPUBLICAN?—We do not open this question with reference to Judge Swan. That is not material to our purpose. But the ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD of last week contains an article charging upon the Republicans the responsibility of his decision in the Oberlin case. It may be sufficient to tell THE STANDARD that Judge Swan was elected by a general "opposition" vote in 1854, before the Republican party was formed, and the year before Chase was elected Governor. And Judge Scott was nominated before the Philadelphia platform was adopted. His decision certainly was not Republican. The Republican Convention of June 2 did pass a resolution endorsing the action of the *Republican* State officers and members of Congress; but Judge Swan, never having belonged to the Republican party, could not have been included, and the vote by which his nomination was rejected does not look much like an endorsement.—*Ashtabula (O.) Sentinel.*

We are sorry to see in the *Sentinel* what we cannot help regarding as an example of petty quibbling. It seeks, upon a mere *technicality*, to exculpate the Republican party from responsibility for the decision of Judge Swan. He was elected, it seems, by the aid of the anti-slavery voters of the Reserve, and by the support of the *Sentinel* itself, before they had changed the name of their party from "Free Soil" to "Republican"; and therefore the Republicans are not responsible! Will the *Sentinel* deny that the political anti-slavery papers and voters of Ohio supported Judge Swan? If they did, of what consequence is it whether the party was then called "Republican" or "Free Soil"?

We should be less inclined to notice this petty shuffling in regard to the past if the *Sentinel* and the Republicans of the Reserve were not at this moment supporting as a candidate for the seat soon to be vacated by Judge Swan a man of whose soundness on the *habeas corpus* question they can give no guarantee whatever beyond the bare fact, that, like Tom Corwin and many other supporters of the Fugitive Slave law, he belongs to the Republican party! Why does not the *Sentinel*, at this solemn crisis, insist upon *knowing* the opinions of its candidate for the supreme bench, instead of contenting itself with the privilege of *inferring* that they are right from premises which do not authorize such a conclusion? This sort of jugglery is unworthy of men professing to be leaders in the cause of freedom at any time, but especially now, when so much depends upon the course to be pursued by the men who may be elected to judicial station.

A HERETIC EXCOMMUNICATED.—That arch-heretic, Rev. J. L. Hatch, after being kept suspended for several months, was, on Tuesday evening last, finally and forever cut off, excluded and excommunicated from the loving care, communion and fellowship of that body of professing Christians in this city under the pastoral charge of Rev. Dr. Cheever, for heretical views respecting Sunday. The Rev. gentleman was present, and requested to be heard in his own behalf, if only for five minutes. It was put to the vote whether such liberty of speech should be granted him, or whether he should be required to answer simply "Yes" or "No" to the question of recantation, and the latter course was decided on. The final vote on the question of excommunication stood 14 in favor and 3 against. Dr. Ball, one of the minority opposed to excommunication, declared that the rights of Mr. Hatch had, in his opinion, been "grossly and scandalously outraged."—*Herald, 14th.*

We suppose this excommunication, according to the standards of Congregationalism, is all correct; certainly we, as Abolitionists, have no right to criticize it. But we *have* a right to ask why the Church of the Puritans does not exercise the same vigilance in the application of discipline to the apologists of slavery that it employs to rid itself of responsibility for what it deems heretical opinions upon the Sabbath question? The Sabbath, however divine, is not "made in the image of God," and therefore not so sacred as even the meanest slave; and yet the Church of the Puritans is less tolerant of "heresy" in regard to the mode of observing that day, which an Apostle calls "a shadow," than it is of opinions which favor the transmutation of God's immortal children into articles of merchandise! That Church, while excluding a man from its pale for holding the opinions of Martin Luther and John Calvin in relation to the Sabbath, stands in ecclesiastical relations with scores, nay hundreds, of pro-slavery ministers and Churches, many of them open defenders or apologists of slavery from the Scriptures!

THE SLAVE TRADE.

THAT the party which desires and intends to break down all the barriers against the slave trade is rapidly gaining ground at the South, there is no room for doubt; and yet the conservative journals of the North pretend to believe that there is not the slightest ground to fear that the project will succeed. Just as, in 1838 and onward, they derided as unnecessary the effort to arouse the North to the impending danger of Texan annexation, and in 1854 declared that the honor of the South was a sure guarantee that the Missouri restriction would not be repealed, they now seek to lull the people of the North into a false security in regard to the project for the restoration of the foreign traffic in slaves. "There is no need," they say, "of any agitation on the subject; the people of the South may be trusted to defeat the crazy schemes of the fire-eaters." But no man who has watched the movements of the Slave Power for the last twenty years can fail to see in the daily succession of events at the South irrefragible evidence that that Power, if not speedily met and vanquished, is perfectly certain to go on, step by step, until it whitens the Atlantic with slave vessels bearing the American flag. The speech of Mr. Stephens of Georgia, which will be found in another column, though carefully guarded, points clearly to this result. And here is an extract of a letter from the Washington correspondent of *The Herald*, to which we invite particular attention:

WASHINGTON, July 10, 1859.

Hon. Jefferson Davis, before leaving the North for Mississippi, secluded himself for a few days in the western part of Maryland, in order to prepare the outline of a speech which has either already been or shortly will be delivered to his constituents on the subject of the African slave trade. In opposition to his colleague, Senator Brown, Colonel Davis contends that the introduction of "savages" (as newly imported negroes are called in the South) would be injurious to the material interests of Mississippi. He takes strong ground, however, in favor of the right of every other State to do what it pleases in the matter, without interference from the Federal government. He purposes even bringing in a bill, immediately after the opening of the next Congress, abrogating the laws which declare the slave trade to be piracy. It is supposed that this *via media* course of acknowledging on the one hand the theoretical rights of the ultra slave trade men, while locally exposing the practical disadvantage to planters of amalgamating a totally barbarous slave element with the old slave population, will reconcile the differences that have been growing so formidable of late in the South with respect to the slave traffic.

Carefully as the secret has been guarded by those interested, it is well known throughout the entire South that a very large number of slaves have been landed, chiefly on the Florida coast, within the past twelve months. A very distinguished Democratic Senator informed me, within the last week, that his estimate of the number of cargoes of "savages" that had been successfully transported into the interior of the country since May, 1848, was between sixty and seventy. He added that the boast had been semi-confidentially made to him, six weeks ago, by an individual interested, that twelve slave vessels, whose names were known to him, would discharge their living freight upon our shores within ninety days. Supposing each vessel to contain, deducting loss by death, two hundred and fifty blacks, the late increase of slave population at the South, by importation from the coast of Africa, must have been over fifteen thousand. Startling as this fact appears, I have not ventured to communicate it to you until fully persuaded that it cannot be contradicted; or, if gainsayed, that its truth may within a short period be demonstrated.

UNWARRANTED INFERENCES.

WORCESTER, Mass., July 10, 1859.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

IT is a little amusing to notice the jubilant tone of the letter of your Connecticut correspondent, Kiwa, who, because one Church in New England, by the vote of a small minority of its members, at a very small meeting of its body, has passed anti-slavery resolutions of a sterling and sound character, claims that "Orthodoxy in Massachusetts is redeeming itself"—"A movement is fairly begun in the Congregational Churches, that will not be likely to end till all the pro-slavery spots on their dishonored escutcheon are thoroughly wiped out."

Pro-slavery *spots!* indeed! As though the escutcheon were a field of Christian anti-slavery whiteness, with only a few pro-slavery spots to dishonor it! A mistake, Kiwa, altogether a mistake. The field is one of pro-slavery blackness, with only this *little* white spot, and Kiwa can find no other spot of equal whiteness and size with this, small as it is.

"The unanimous vote of a Church of 214 members"! "The hearty adoption 'with a will'"! And yet Kiwa probably knew that the meeting by which these resolutions were adopted (which was the largest of the three that considered them), contained only forty of those two hundred members, and that, of the forty, only fifteen voted for them. To be sure, none voted against them, though some strongly opposed them, and the pastor's influence was against them.

Surely "drowning men catch at straws." Of course, this action is worthy of note; but to assume, therefore, that "Orthodoxy is redeeming itself" is too much of a piece with the inference of Kiwa that the Church Anti-Slavery Society represents the silent democracy of the Church. All true friends of freedom must rejoice at this movement; but before we go into exultant jubilation thereat, let us wait to see if the movement is responded to by any considerable part of the New England Church, or by any part of it at all, or whether this very Church makes this action a living testimony or leaves it a dead letter, only using it, as occasion requires, as a cloak to its doughfacedness.

How was the call for a Church Anti-Slavery Society responded to by the Church? Kiwa knows, as well as any one else, probably, that when all effort had been made to call the three thousand clergymen of the New England Church, with the other representatives thereof, to Worcester, to form a Church Anti-Slavery, only *sixteen clergymen* and *nine laymen* from outside the city came up to respond to the call, which, added to six of the thirteen settled evangelical clergymen of the city, and two without charge, with eleven laymen, made the whole convocation of forty-four souls, designated in the official roll as twenty-four clergymen, three deacons, one honorable, one Quaker, seven esquires, seven ordinary church-members and one not described! How mightily the mountain labored, and how small the mouse! And yet this mighty gathered exponent of New England Orthodoxy spent a large part of its time in discussing the question whether slavery was of itself sinful! And when, finally, it voted that it was, a larger percentage of these valorous forty-four voted nay than in the Salem street Church voted yea to its recently-passed resolutions.

Nothing can be more gratifying than the knowledge of the fact that some are struggling for the right, even down in the deep filth and defilement of the pro-slavery Church, and we are all highly pleased to see even so small a spark of light in the depths of its abysmal darkness; but nothing is more ridiculous than claiming this little spot of brightness as a specimen of the whole, and that the Church Anti-Slavery Society or the Salem street Church resolutions are the characteristics of the Church itself, or give evidence that Orthodoxy is redeeming itself. J. A. H.

JUDGE GHOLSON, the Republican candidate for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, was formerly a slaveholder in Mississippi. The Democratic papers say that, before coming to Ohio, he sold his slaves and pocketed the money. This may, perhaps, be a slander; but there is not a particle of evidence, that we have seen or heard of, that he is a whit sounder on the *habeas corpus* question than Judge Swan. His own son, still a citizen of Mississippi, in a letter to a newspaper of that State, says:

"Personally, my can't-get-overable and perhaps foolish sectional prejudice would lead me to regret his [my father's] nomination by the late Convention at Columbus, and that he did not adhere to the resolution he formed some months since of returning to the practice of his profession; but, be it as it may, *I would willingly stake all I hold dear, dearer than life itself, that, if elected, he will perform his duties to the true letter and spirit of the law, even to the remanding of a negro lawfully claimed to his master, without deviating to the right or to the left, for or against the rules, regulations, tenets, doctrines or platforms of any faction, sect, party or organization under the sun.* His oath of office would obligate him to do this, if his sense of honor and his duty to his fellows did not likewise render it obligatory; and, sir, there is still a little honor left in the world—yes, and in Ohio even, though politicians *are* hustling it out as fast as they can."

Judge Gholson either does or does not agree with Judge Swan upon the question of State sovereignty involved in the refusal of the Supreme Court of Ohio to issue a *habeas corpus* for the release of the Oberlin rescuers. His views are of the utmost importance to the voters of Ohio; why does not Mr. Giddings call upon him to express them honorably and frankly?

THEODORE PARKER'S EXPERIENCE.*

To the multitude of Mr. Parker's friends, not only in this country, but in Europe, this book, sad as was the occasion of its preparation, will be peculiarly welcome. Those who have not only listened to his preaching, but enjoyed the pleasure of personal intercourse with him as their pastor and friend, will read with exquisite satisfaction this frank and affectionate disclosure of the aims, aspirations, discouragements and hopes of his ministerial life; while those who know him only as he is revealed in his writings will be grateful for the light which this sketch throws upon a life that has so powerfully affected their own and stirred the thoughts of earnest men in every part of the civilized world.

When the members of Mr. Parker's Society found that he was too ill to continue his ministerial labors, and that he must leave them for a time, perhaps forever, they sent him a most affectionate letter, signed by three hundred of their number, recalling the circumstances under which he commenced his ministry in Boston, expressing their gratitude for the benefits derived from his preaching and example, and their solicitude for his recovery. It was in reply to this letter, kindly withheld from him until after his arrival at Santa Cruz, that he wrote this sketch of his "Experience as a Minister" and of the incidents of his early life. A more charming piece of autobiography has rarely been published. If it should even prove to be his last word to those who have shared the benefits of his ministry and loved him for his unswerving fidelity to his convictions, their affection could hardly ask for more. "As this letter," he says, "is confidential and addressed only to YOU, I could wish it might be read only to the members of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, or printed solely for their affection, not also published for the eye of the world; but that were impossible, for what is offered to the hearts of so many thereby becomes accessible to the eyes and ears of all who wish to see and hear; so what I write private to you becomes public also for mankind, whether I will or no." How many will be thankful for the "impossibility" of restriction which puts so delightful a piece of personal history within their reach!

Of Mr. Parker as a theologian we have no right to speak; but as a reformer and a fellow-laborer with us in the anti-slavery cause, he has the strongest claims upon our attention; and our readers, of every shade of religious belief, will be glad to see in these columns anything that illustrates this phase of his character. We shall, therefore, present some extracts from the volume before us; and we commence by citing a passage which gives us a key to the author's whole life. After stating that in his early boyhood he *felt* he was to be a minister, but that when the time came to choose a profession he seriously considered whether it was not best to be a lawyer, he proceeds:

"Though I hesitated some time, soon as I got clearness of sight, I returned to my first love, for that seemed free from guile. I then asked myself these three questions:

"1. 'Can you seek for what is Eternally True, and not be blinded by the opinions of any sect, or of the Christian Church; and can you tell that Truth you learn, even when it is unpopular and hated?' I answered, 'I CAN!' Rash youth is ever confident.

"2. 'Can you seek the Eternal Right, and not be blinded by the statutes and customs of men, ecclesiastical, political and social; and can you declare that Eternal Right you discover, applying it to the actual life of man, individual and associated, though it bring you into painful relations with men?' Again, I swiftly answered, 'I CAN!'

"3. 'Can you represent in your life that Truth of the intellect and that Right of the conscience, and so not disgrace with your character what you preach with your lips?' I doubted of this more than the others; the temptation to personal wickedness seemed stronger than that to professional deceit—at least it was then better known; but I answered, 'I CAN TRY, AND WILL!'

"Alas! I little knew all that was involved in these three questions, and their prompt, youthful answers. I understand it better now."

If every young man about to enter the ministry were to put to himself these questions, with the determination not to take a single step toward the consummation of his plan until he could honestly answer them in the affirmative, our pulpits would not long be filled with cowards who dare not apply the principles of the gospel to a popular sin.

We pass over as inappropriate to these columns Mr. Parker's account of the gradual development of his religious opinions, and of the influences that surrounded him while engaged in the studies preliminary to his ordination. He congratulates himself that he began his ministry in "the most interesting period of New England's spiritual history," when "Mr. Garrison and his friends, inheriting what was best in the Puritans, fired with the zeal of the Hebrew Prophets and Christian Martyrs, while they were animated with a spirit of humanity rarely found in any of the three, was beginning his noble work, but in style so humble that, after much search, the Police of Boston discovered there was nothing dangerous in it, for 'his only visible auxiliary was a negro boy.'" "Dr. Channing was in the full maturity of his powers, and, after long preaching the Dignity of Man as an abstraction, and Purity as a purely inward life, with rare and winsome eloquence, and ever progressive humanity, began to apply his sublime doctrines to actual life, in the Individual, the State and the Church. In the name of Christianity the great American Unitarian called for . . . . the liberation of the American slave." "Pierpont, single-handed, was fighting a grand and two-fold battle." "The brilliant genius of Emerson rose in the winter nights, and hung over Boston, drawing the eyes of ingenuous young people to look up to that great new star, a beauty and a mystery." "The rights of labor were discussed with deep philanthropic feeling," and "the natural rights of woman began to be inquired into." "Prominent anti-slavery men were dropped out of all wealthy society in Boston; their former friends not knowing them in the street; Mr. Garrison was mobbed by men in handsome coats, and found defence from their fury only in a jail," &c. &c. He dwells upon the incidents of his ministry in West Roxbury, the persecution he suffered for daring to preach his honest convictions, his lectures in Boston, his voyage to Europe for recreation and study, and comes at length to the circumstances of his settlement in Boston. He then states, under separate heads, the "scheme of doctrine" which he has taught, and discloses his plans of ministerial and personal labor, some of which are yet far from being consummated. Of his labors as a lecturer he says:

"For a dozen years or more, I have done my share of lecturing in public, having many invitations more than I could accept. The task was always disagreeable, contrary to my natural disposition and my scholarly habits. But I saw the nation had reached an important crisis in its destination, and, though ignorant of the fact, yet stood hesitating between two principles. The one was Slavery, which I knew leads at once to Military Despotism—political, ecclesiastical, social—and ends at last in utter and hopeless ruin; for no People fallen on that road has ever risen again; it is the path so many other Republics have taken and finished their course, as Athens and the Ionian towns have done, as Rome and the Commonwealths of the Middle Ages. The other was Freedom, which leads at once to Industrial Democracy—respect for labor, government over all, by all, for the sake of all, rule after the Eternal Right as it is writ in the Constitution of the Universe—securing welfare and progress. I saw that these four social forces were advising, driving, coaxing, wheedling the People to take the road to ruin; that our 'great men,' in which 'America is so rich beyond all other nations of the earth,' went strutting along that path to show how safe it is, crying out 'Democracy,' 'Constitution,' 'Washington,' 'Gospel,' 'Christianity,' 'Dollar,' and the like, while the instincts of the people, the traditions of our history, and the rising genius of men and women well-born in these times of peril, with still, small voice, whispered some thing of Self-evident Truths and Unalienable Rights.

"I knew the power of a great Idea; and spite of the Market, the State, the Church, the Press, I thought a few earnest men in the Lecture Halls of the North might yet incline the People's mind and heart to Justice and the Eternal Law of God—the only safe rule of conduct for nations, as for you and me—and so make the American experiment a triumph and a joy for all Humankind. Nay, I thought I could myself be of some service in that work; for the nation was yet so young, and the instinct of popular liberty so strong, it seemed to me a little added weight would turn the scale to Freedom. So I appointed myself a Home Missionary for Lectures.

"Then, too, I found I could say what I pleased in the lecture-room, so long as I did not professedly put my thought into a theologic or political shape; while I kept the form of literature or philosophy, I could discourse of what I thought most important, and men would listen one hour, two hours, nay, three hours; and the more significant the subject was, the more freely, profoundly and fairly it was treated, the more would the people come, the more eagerly listen and enthusiastically accept. So I spared no labor in preparation or delivery, but took it for granted the humblest audience, in the least intelligent town or city, was quite worthy of my best efforts, and could understand my facts and metaphysic reasonings. I did not fear the people would be offended, though I hurt their feelings never so sore.

"Besides, the work was well paid for in the large towns, while the small ones did all they could afford—giving the lecturer for a night more than the schoolmaster for a month. The money thus acquired enabled me to do four desirable things, which it is not needful to speak of here.

"Since 1848, I have lectured eighty or a hundred times each year—in every Northern State east of the Mississippi, once also in a slave State, and on Slavery itself. I have taken most exciting and important subjects, of the greatest concern to the American People, and treated them independent of sect or party, street or press, and with what learning and talent I could command. I put the matter in quite various forms—for each audience is made up of many. For eight or ten years, on the average, I have spoken to sixty or a hundred thousand persons in each year, besides addressing you on Sundays, in the great Hall you threw open to all comers.

"Thus I have had a wide field of operation, where I might rouse the Sentiment of Justice and Mercy, diffuse such Ideas as I thought needful for the welfare and progress of the people, and prepare for such Action as the occasion might one day require. As I was supposed to stand nearly alone, and did not pretend to represent any one but myself, nobody felt responsible for me; so all could judge me, if not fairly, at least with no party or sectarian prejudice in my favor; as I felt responsible only to myself and my God, I could speak freely: this was a two-fold advantage. I hope I have not spoken in vain. I thought that by each lecture I could make a new, deep and lasting impression of some Great Truth on five thoughtful men, out of each thousand who heard me. Don't think me extravagant; it is only *one half of one per cent.!* If I spoke but thus efficiently

welcomed a sermon in Boston; how could you help the natural indecorum? When, roused by these jubilant guns, one minister, so generous and self-devoted, too, in many a noble work, called on his parishioners to enforce that wicked act, which meant to kidnap mine, and declared that if a fugitive sought shelter with him he would drive him away from his own door; when another uttered words more notorious, and yet more flagrant with avaricious inhumanity, which I care not now to repeat again; and when the cry, 'No Higher Law!' went down from the Market, and, intoned by the doctrinal leaders of the sects, rang through so many Commercial Churches throughout the Northern land—I did not dare refuse to proclaim the monstrous fact as one of the unavoidable effects of Slavery, whose evil seed must bear fruit after its kind, and to gibbet the wrong before the eyes of the People, to whom I appealed for common Justice and common Humanity. When two men, holding mean offices under the Federal Government, one of them not fit by nature to do a cruel deed, actually stole and kidnapped two innocent inhabitants out from your city of Franklin, and Hancock, and Adams, and attempted, with their unclean, ravenous jaws, to seize yet others, and rend the manhood out of them, I preached against these Jackals of Slavery and their inhuman work; and have now only to lament that my powers of thought and speech were no more adequate fully to expose the dark infamy of that foul deed, against which I asked alike the People's Justice and their Wrath; I knew I should not ask in vain. And when a drunken Bully from South Carolina, in Congress, fully representing the First Principle, if not the first persons of his State—where none can serve in even the Lower House of Assembly 'unless he be seized in his own right of ten Negro Slaves'—made his assault, not less cowardly than brutal, on our noble Senator, wounding him with worse than death, and while the United States Attorney sought 'to make murder safe and easy in the Capital,' not dreaming it would one day, unpunished reach his own heart—I spoke of that matter, and showed it was the cowards of Massachusetts who drew the blow on her faithful champion, and that no 'anodyne' could make them less than glad that it was struck!

"But why speak more of these sad days? Others may come with sterner face, not black, but red! However, a blessed change in public opinion now goes calmly on in Massachusetts, in New England and all the North, spite of the sophistry and cunning of ambitious men smit with the Presidential fever. The death of a dozen leading anti-slavery men to-day would not much retard it, for the ground is full of such!"

We turn back to quote what he says of Political Preaching:

"The American people are making one of the most important experiments ever attempted on earth, endeavoring to establish an Industrial Democracy, with the principle that men are equal in their natural rights, which can be alienated only by the personal misconduct of their possessor: the great body of the People is the source of all political power, the maker of all laws, the ultimate arbiter of all measures; while the special magistrates, high and low, are but appointed agents, acting under the power of an attorney the people entrust them with. This experiment was perhaps never tried before, certainly not on so large a scale, and with so fair an opportunity for success; but wise men have always foretold its utter failure, and pointed to the past as confirming this prophecy. Certainly, we have Human History against us, but I think Human Nature is on our side, and find no reason to doubt the triumph of the American idea. So I have taken a deep interest in Politics, important not merely as representing the national House-keeping, but also the public Morality, and so tending to help or hinder the people's success. Never failing to vote, I have yet kept myself out of the harness of every party; responsible to none and for none, I have been free to blame or praise the Principles and the Purposes of all, their Measures and their Men. Addressing such multitudes, most of them younger than I, in times like the last fourteen years, when such important Interests came up for public adjudication, and when the great Principles of national morality have been solemnly denied by famous officials, men also of great personal power, who declared that human governments were amenable to no natural Law of God, but subject only to the Caprice of Magistrate or Elector, I have felt a profound sense of my responsibility to you as a teacher of Religion. So I have preached many Political Sermons, examined the special Measures proposed, exposing the Principle they rested on, and the Consequences they must produce, and applying the lessons of experience, the laws of human nature, the great doctrines of Absolute Religion to the special conduct of the American People. No doubt, I have often wounded the feelings of many of YOU. Pardon me, my friends! if I live long, I doubt not I shall do so again and again. You never made me your minister to flatter, or merely to please, but to instruct and serve.

"Treating of politics, I must speak of the conspicuous men engaged therein, when they come to die, for such are the idols of their respective parties. In America there are few objects of conventional respect—no permanent classes who are born to be reverenced; and as men love to look up and do homage to what seems superior, a man of vulgar greatness, who has more of the sort of talent all have much of, is sure to become an idol if he will but serve the passions of his worshippers: so with us, a great man of that stamp has a more irresistible power than elsewhere among civilized men; for he takes the place of king, noble and priest, and controls the public virtue more. The natural function of a great man is to help the little ones: by this test I have endeavored to try such as I must needs speak of. Not responsible for their vice or virtue, I have sought to represent them exactly as I found them, and that, too, without regard to the opinion of men, who only looked up and worshipped, not asking what. If I were an assayer of metals, I should feel bound to declare the character of the specimens brought before me, whether lead or silver; shall I be less faithful in my survey of a great man, 'more precious than the fine gold of Ophir'? I am no flatterer, nor public liar-general; when such a one is wanted, he is easily found, and may be had cheap; and I cannot treat great men like great babies. So, when I preached on Mr. Adams, who had done the cause of Freedom such great service, on General Taylor and Mr. Webster, I aimed to paint them exactly as they were, that their Virtues might teach us, and their Vices warn. Still further to promote the higher education of the people, and correct an idolatry as fatal as it is stupid, as dangerous to the public as it is immediately profitable to wily rhetoricians, I have prepared lectures on four great famous Americans—Franklin, Washington, Adams and Jefferson. The last, however was not delivered when my present illness laid me low. I wished to daguerreotype these great, noble men, and place true pictures before the people.

"Perhaps no part of my public labors has been condemned with more noise and violence than this attempt at historic truth. Certainly I did depart from the panegyrical custom of political and clerical eulogizers of the famous or the wealthy dead; but I have confidence enough in the People of the Northern States to believe they will prefer plain truth to the most rhetorical lies.

"I have not quite disdained to turn your eyes to little, mean men, when set in high office, that you might get instruction from their folly or wickedness. So, when the chief magistrate of the City was notoriously the comrade of drunkards, and of the most infamous of humankind, and that of the State was celebrated chiefly for public and private lying, and both abused their office, to promote their own little purposes of mischief or of gain, debauching the public virtue, as well as wasting the People's money, I did not fail to advertise the fact, that YOU at least might learn by the lesson which cost the public so dear."

We close our extracts with some touching and eloquent passages from that part of his Letter in which Mr. Parker speaks of his illness, of the hopes and fears which it induces, of the strong ties which bind him to his congregation and to life, and of his entire resignation to the will and providence of God.

"For some years, I have been warned that I was not only spending the full income of life, but encroaching a little on the capital stock. But what wise man even is always wise? The duties were so urgent, the call for help so imploring, the labor at once so delightful in its process and so prophetic of good results, and I felt such confidence in my bodily power and ancestral longevity, that I did not sufficiently heed the gentle admonition; till, last year, in March, Nature at once gave way, and I was compelled to yield to a necessity above my will. I need not tell the fluctuations in my health since then; rather, my Friends, let me again thank YOU for the prompt and generous sympathy you gave then and ever since.

"Immediately after my present illness, I left your Pulpit empty for a day. YOU wrote me a letter signed by many a dear familiar name; and but for the haste, I know it had been enriched with the signatures of all; it was dated at Boston, January 11. Your affection wrote the lines, and a kindred wisdom kept them from me till I was able to bear this unexpected testimonial of your sympathy and love. On Sunday, the sixth of March, while you were listening to—alas! I know not whom you looked to then—my eyes filled with tears as I first read your words of delicate appreciation and esteem. My Friends, I wish I were worthy of such reverence and love; that my service were equal to your gratitude. I have had more than sufficient reward for my labors with you; not only have I seen a good work and a great prosper in my hands as you he'd them up, but in public, and still more in private, you have given me the sweetest, best of outward consolation:—the grateful sympathy of earnest, thoughtful and religious men. If my public life has been a battle, wherein my head grows bald, my beard turns gray, and my arms become feeble, before their time, it has been also a Triumph, whose crown is not woven of the red-flowered laurels of war, but of the olive, the lily, the violet, and the white rose of peace. I have no delight in controversy; when assailed, I have never returned the assault; and though continually fired upon for many years from the bar-room and the pulpit, and many another 'coigne of vantage' betwixt the two, I never in return shot back an arrow, in private or public, until in the United States Court I was arraigned for the 'misdemeanor' of making a speech in Faneuil Hall against that kidnapping in Boston, perpetrated by the public guardian of widows and orphans; then I prepared my *Defence*, which had been abler were I more a lawyer, though less a minister.

"To compose sermons, and preach them to multitudes of men of one sort but many conditions, then to setting forth the great Truths of Absolute Religion, and applying them to the various events of this wondrous human life, trying to make the Constitution of the Universe the Common Law of men, illustrating my thought with all that I can gather from the World of Matter, its use and beauty both, and from the World of Man, from human labors, sorrows, joys and everlasting hopes—this has been my great delight. Your pulpit has been my joy and my throne. Though Press and State, Market and Meeting-House, have been hostile to us, YOU have yet given me the largest Protestant audience in America, save that which Orthodox Mr. Beecher, who breaks with no theologic tradition of the New England Church, inspires with his deep emotional nature, so devout and so humane, and charms with his poetic eloquence, that is akin to both the sweetbrier and the rose and all the beauty which springs up wild amid New England hills, and to the loveliness of common life; I have given you my sermons in return, at once my labor and delight. My Life is in them, and all my character, its good and ill; thereby you know me better than I, perhaps, myself—for a man's words and his face when excited in sermon and in prayer tell all he is, the reflection of what he has done. Sermons are never out of my mind; and when sickness brings on me the consciousness that I have nought to do, its most painful part, still, by long habit all things will take this form; and the gorgeous vegetation of the Tropics, their fiery skies so brilliant all the day, and star-lit too with such exceeding beauty all the night; the glittering fishes in the market, as many-colored as a gardener's show, these Josephs of the sea; the silent pelicans, flying forth at morning and back again at night; the strange, fantastic trees, the dry pod-rattling their historic bones all day, while the new bloom comes fragrant out beside, a noiseless prophecy; the ducks rejoicing in the long-expected rain; a negro on an ambling pad; the slender-legged, half-naked negro children in the street, playing their languid games, or oftener screaming 'neath their mother's blows, amid black swine, hens and uncounted dogs; the never-ceasing clack of women's tongues, more shrewd than female in their shrill violence; the unceasing, multifarious kindness of our hostess; and, overtowering all, the self-sufficient, West Indian Creole pride, alike contemptuous of toil, and ignorant and impotent of thought—all these common things turn into poetry as I look on or am compelled to hear, and then transfigure into sermons, which come also spontaneously by night and give themselves to me, and even in my sleep say they are meant for YOU." Shall they ever be more than the walking of

> 'a sick man in his sleep,
> Three paces, and then faltering'?

The doctors cannot tell; I also know not, but hope and strive to live a little longer, that I may work much more. Oh, that the truths of Absolute Religion, which Human Nature demands, and offers, too, from the Infinitely Perfect God who dwells therein, while He transcends the Universe, Oh, that these were an Idea enlightening all men's minds, a Feeling in their hearts, and Action in their outward life! Oh, that America's two and thirty thousand ministers, Hebrew, Coristian, Mormon, knew these truths, and to mankind preached Piety and Morality, and that Theology which is the Science of God and his two-fold Universe, and forgot their mythologic and misguiding dreams! Then what a New World were ours! Sure I would gladly live to work for this.

"I may recover entirely, and stand before you full of brown health, equal to the manifold labors of that position, live to the long period of my fathers, and at last die naturally of old age. This to me seems most desirable, though certainly not most probable.

"Or, I may so far recover that I shall falter on a score of years or so, one eye on my work, the other on my body, which refuses to do it, and so urge my weak and balky horse along a miry, broken road. If this be so, then, in some still, little rural nook, in sight of town, but not too nigh, I may finish some of the many things I have begun, and left for the afternoon or evening of my days; and yet, also, from to time, meet you again, and, with words of lofty cheer, look on the inspiring face of a great congregation. With this I should be well content; once it was the ideal of my hope.

"In either of these cases, I see how the time of this illness, and the discipline alike of disappointment and recovery, would furnish me new power. Several times in my life has it happened that I have met with something worse than death, and, in my short-sighted folly, I said, 'Oh, that I had wings like a dove! for then would I fly away and be at rest!' Yet my griefs all turned into blessings; the joyous seed I planted came up Discipline, and I wished to tear it from the ground; but it flowered fair, and bore a sweeter, sounder fruit than I expected from what I set in earth. As I look over my life, I find no disappointment and no sorrow I could afford to lose; the cloudy morning has turned out the fairer day; the wounds of my enemies have done me good. So wondrous is this Human Life, not ruled by Fate, but Providence, which is Wisdom married unto Love, each infinite! What has been, may be. If I recover wholly, or but in part, I see new sources of power beside these waters of affliction I have stooped at; I shall not think I have gone through 'the Valley of Baca' in vain, nor begrudge the time that I have lingered there, seeming idle; rainy days also help seed the ground. One thing I am sure of; I have learned the wealth and power of the grateful, generous feelings of men, as I knew them not before, nor hoped on earth to find so rich. High as I have thought of Human Nature, I had not quite done justice to the present growth of these beautiful faculties. Here and now, as so oft before, I have found more treasure than I dreamed lay hidden where I looked.

"But if neither of these hopes becomes a fact, if the silver cord part soon above the fountain, and the golden bowl be broke, let not us complain; a new bowl, and a stronger cord, shall serve the Well of Life for you. Though quite aware how probable this seems, believe me, I have not yet had a single hour of sadness; trust me, I shall not. True, it is not pleasant to leave the plough broken in the furrow just begun, while the seed-corn smiles in the open sack, impatient to be sown, and the whole field promises such liberal return. To say Farewell to the thousands I have been wont to preach to, and pray with, now joyous, and tearful now—it has its bitterness to one not eighty-four, but forty-eight. To undo the natural ties more intimately knit of long-continued friend-ship and of love—this is the bitter part. But if it be my lot, let not you nor me complain. Death comes to none except to bring a blessing; it is no misfortune to lay aside these well-loved weeds of earth, and be immortal. To YOU, as a Congregation, my loss may be supplied; and to me it is an added consolation to know that however long and tenderly remembered, I should not long be missed; some other will come in my place, perhaps without my defects, possessed of nobler gifts, and certainly not hindered by the ecclesiastical and social hostility which needs must oppose a man who has lived and wrought as I."

POLITICAL PARTIES.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

"A broken reed at best: but oft a spear"—Toning down—The smothering process—The quadrennial debauch.

I WILL take Vermont as a favorable illustration. Up to the Texas annexation and Mexican War the Whig and Democratic parties loaded down the journals of both Houses of Assembly with anti slavery resolutions. The Whigs, especially, being over-ambitious on the subject, "piled Pelion upon Ossa," intermingling a *quantum sufficit* of bravado and defiance towards the South. But the great debauch of 1844 not only brought the Democrats to their knees and made them cover their heads with ashes and eat their own words; it toned down and smothered the sentiment of the Whig masses, so that they became enthusiastic for the man who had "*personally* no objection to the annexation of Texas, but would be glad to see it," &c., and reasserted the odious and diabolical sentiments of an old speech which declared that "two hundred years had sanctioned and *sanctified* human slavery."

Meantime the "Liberty party" had been inaugurated, and was making handsome progress. And it bore, with becoming patience, the charge of having defeated Mr. Clay. The sins of Polk were laid at our door too; as if, in case we would not sacrifice our principles and conscience by voting for "the *second worst devil in the Universe*" (for this is the upshot of the doctrine "of two evils choose the least"), we could be saddled with all the responsibility of the wicked doings of the "first devil of the Universe." Still the Whigs claimed to stand firm on the "Wilmot Proviso" and the Ordinance of '87. When the debauch of 1848 came on, the National Convention having distinctly repudiated all its former anti-slavery professions and choked down such men as Charles Allen of Mass., and our own Horace Everett, there were very great risings of stomach at the mingled dose of ignorance, rowdyism, gunpowder and negroes presented to their lips. However, after suitable retchings and the administration of anodynes, it went down. But, on the passage of the Fugitive Slave act, the Vermont Whigs were indignant, and they came into the indignation meetings to let off steam. The event proved that it was nothing *but* steam. For, at their State Convention in 1851, they endorsed Fillmore's administration, Fugitive Slave bill and all; yet, as they *said*, with some misgivings. And when their platform was eviscerated at Baltimore, and the gag put on, in 1852, the remembrance of "Lundy's Lane," with the song of "Hail to the Chief," soon reconciled the rank and file to the debauch. Meantime the "Liberty party," toning down to Free Soilism and Free Democracy, had become so great in *numbers* as to be worth having in the elections. So the Democratic party, almost to a man, went over to it in 1849. The "Union" (as it was called) took this type. We will endorse as strong resolutions against slavery as you can frame, but you shall vote for a good share of our men, and we'll all be still about such matters as U. S. Bank, Sub-Treasury, Tariff, &c. But the very *next year* resolutions were introduced and discussed against the Bank and in favor of the Treasury. And, in 1851, those resolutions were passed! But, to cap the climax, in 1852, resolutions adopting the action of the party in 1849 and 1851 as a permanent platform were declared passed! A count was called for, but the chair decided that it was too late! So we had adopted our bond not to even agitate certain matters and the breach of that bond in the agitation and passage of them!! Here was the end of the *moral* power of the party. In 1853, by gathering up all the odds and ends, the dead fish and seaweed of this party and the old Democratic party, a "bargain and sale" were effected so as to give Rum, Slavery, Popery and Sham Democracy the Governor and Lieut. Governor of the State. And thus our measure of infamy was full. Then came "Kansas-Nebraska," and, oh! what pious horror the Whig party and Liberty men were filled with! One of the wickedest compromises of the world was repealed!! Yes, and such *perfidy!* The South would "not let us stick to even a *bad* bargain." Well, most of the people of Vermont were truly indignant and willing "to cast aside everything but Temperance and Liberty," and form a union upon that basis. And they *did* form such a Union. It was the 13th of July, 1854, five years ago to-day. And then, there in the people's State-House, at *their* capital, was the only true, *model Convention* that I ever saw in this State. The *people* were there themselves. And they said and did what they *pleased*. They preached, sang and prayed. Every *one* of those thousands voted the Fugitive Slave act "wicked and unconstitutional"; and but *one* among them all voted in the negative upon a stringent resolution in favor of the Maine Law. Where were the politicians? They stood outside the ring and trembled like an aspen leaf. And so *began the Republican party in Vermont.* But how it has been *managed since*, and what and where it is now, I will tell you anon.

HARRINGTON.

Our European Correspondence.

LETTERS FROM HARRIET MARTINEAU.....No. IX.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

July 4th, 1859.

SIR: The Fourth of July comes to those who know its significance under widely different aspects to-day. I imagine you, sir, sitting in the midst of the din of rejoicing in your great city. Music and marchings, squibs of gunpowder and of human speech, are perhaps penetrating your office, and rousing emotions of something else than joy and exultation. Many of your New England comrades are probably assembling under the shade of groves, to take counsel how to convert the actual reproach that clings to this anniversary into a truer honor than it has ever yet deserved. In many places your political fellow-citizens are no doubt pushing their personal interests in the name of their country; and alas! in how many places are your black fellow-countrymen undergoing the insult and injury of the rejoicings of this day! Our hearts are heavy for those of them who know and feel the insult and injury; but much more for those who do not—for the degraded beings who are making their own small capital out of the occasion in the shape of a noisy, grinning holiday. One distinguished fellow-citizen of yours,—Mr. Seward, is, I believe, among the Scotch mountains to-day, or in some ancient Scotch city teeming with historical associations. He was at Stirling on Saturday. I hope he will tell you, some day, how that great mediæval monument appeared to his eyes while his mind was full of the stir and strife of the present time. Mr. Sumner is in London, where I suppose his countrymen are keeping the day with some sort of proud celebration, in which he can hardly join with a free and joyful spirit. I judge only from my former knowledge of him, and not from any information of what he is doing to-day. He has so lately arrived from the continent that I have not even learned with any precision how his health is. His own account of it, I understand, is good; but his friends fear that London, at this season, and in our political crisis, may prove too exciting a scene for him. The Fourth of July is quieter here. The birds in the ivy and the copses are still during the hot noon hours; and only the voices of the haymakers from the field break the silence around me. Even the tall and plumy ash trees scarcely wave; and the great oaks do not move at all. There is probably not one single person in the valley besides myself who remembers the day as anything out of the order of common days; and I like to be alone, and, in the deep summer stillness to think it over. Your number of the 13th ult. has arrived very opportunely to direct my meditations. Your leading article, on the lost opportunity of your country and mine uniting to guide the counsels and the passions of the world, goes as straight to my heart as it could have come from yours. Among the multitude of lost opportunities which turn history into a tragedy, I know of none so utterly mournful as that which ranges your Republic virtually on the side of despotism in the crisis of the struggle which is to determine the fate of the nations of Europe. No amount of enthusiasm on behalf of the Italians, no outcry against the tyranny of Austria and the Pope and Naples, can save the credit of your Republic any more than that of the French empire, while, in your country as in France, there is an absence of the commonest personal liberty, amidst the strongest professions of popular government. While your citizens cannot speak and print all they think, nor enjoy perfect liberty of travel and residence, and while any natives of the soil are treated as less than men and citizens, the world will not heed anything you have to say about the rights of Lombards, Venetians and Hungarians. We regard your Fourth of July, therefore, as we should regard a French celebration of the declaration of principles of 1789—if indeed the French had the audacity (say the impudence) to propose such a celebration as one of the amusements of their slavery. The actual difference between you and the French is that they let their ruler make them pay in person and pocket for the restoration of Italian liberties, amidst a discreet silence about their own; while you American republicans boast of liberties which do not practically exist, while unable to help the struggling peoples of Europe because you have in fact lost your liberties and the reputation of them. These are hard and painful truths to meditate upon on the Fourth of July, but they are truths; and the only comfort is in seeing how vigorously some of you are striving to render them the seed and soil of new liberties.

While we cling, as you do, to the idea of coöperation between us on behalf of human freedom, personal and political, we want to know what we are to think of the change which seems to have come over the policy of your government about the African slave trade. As the wisest people have said a thousand times within the last two years, it rests with the government at Washington to extinguish the African slave trade. Whether the French Emperor is sincere or not in his professed relinquishment of his disguised slave trade, he can be kept harmless by an honest coöperation among his neighbors. Spain can be easily dealt with, whenever Cuba is the only importing country. England is sincere and earnest; so is Portugal; so is France, except a small clique who have made a tool of the Emperor; and whenever your government also is sincere and earnest, the extinction which had proceeded so far will be complete. Well! we are told that your government *is* now sincere and in earnest; and that we shall soon see how effectually your gun-boats sweep the bays of the African coast, and search the rivers, and hover about the shores, preventing the embarkation of negroes on the one side of the Atlantic, and their landing on the other. We are assured that where there has hitherto been a big ship, drawing so much water as to have no control over the doings on land, and occupying a station so as to prevent any English or Portuguese cruiser from learning what was going on in shallows and creeks, in the twilight and under the stars, there will now be vessels better fitted for purposes of superintendence, so that not even the fisherman's skiff can get out to sea without being called to account.

We are told these things just at the time when we are full of wonder and dismay at the actual reopening of the slave trade in your Southern States, and at the declarations of many public orators there that they will obtain the repeal of the laws which forbid the traffic; those laws in fact seeming to us to be a mere dead letter. We have never been able to understand how your citizens could sit still under the practical overthrow of those laws; and now, when some of your politicians propose the repeal of all provisions of the sort, we see your government beginning to stop the slave trade in earnest. When we inquire about the true explanation of so strange a mystery, we are told that it is the beginning of the end; that the anticipated "rebellion" of the non-slaveholding whites of the South is taking the form of getting negroes cheap from Africa, in order to overtake their aristocratic neighbors who have hitherto held a monopoly of laborers; and that, as such importation would be ruinous to that monopoly, the whole influence of the slaveholders is now devoted to stopping the slave trade, and enforcing the laws against it. We are told that this is the method by which Northern and Southern leaders and parties will be brought into union first, and slavery abolished afterwards, as a necessary, though perhaps remote, consequence. How much are we to believe of this? We need not, and shall not, wait to be satisfied with an interpretation of mysteries before acting in the cause. Whenever we find your government disposed to fulfil its duties and engagements about the slave trade, we shall eagerly hail the coöperation, without stopping to discuss your domestic politics; but we cannot but wish to form some idea meantime what to look for in the near future. While learning the case of the non-slaveholding whites from Mr. Helper's book, we have always supposed that when they roused themselves to amend their fortunes, they would betake themselves to free labor and not to the slave trade, which could only bring round another cycle of decline, degradation and adversity. May we not hope that it will yet be so? Are we really to see the union of Southern and Northern parties at the expense of the vast body of non-slaveholding whites? Must we give up the hope of seeing that great body obtaining the control of their despotic neighbors by the employment of free labor and the consequent discrediting of slave labor, and its conversion into free? Are the "mean whites" to be forever "mean"—stealing their laborers, and put down afresh by a coalition between their haughty neighbors and the professing patriots of the North? We had hoped that in the changes which we see must come, the non-slaveholding whites of the South would be among the first to be benefited, morally, politically and materially. Must we see them, after having been depressed into sordid selfishness, pushed for the sin into which that depression has driven them? Cannot they be made the agents, instead of the mere victims, of the abolition of the slave trade, and finally of slavery? We shall not easily give up the hope.

You will see in European newspapers nearly all that we know about the war. The things which are not explained in the newspapers (chiefly because everybody is supposed to know them) are that Germany at large is not inclined to help Austria, on account of the hopeless conduct of the young Emperor; that all outcry of the sort is from two or three servile Courts; that Prussia moves her forces towards the Rhine simply because her Rhine provinces (which are the richest) must help to bear the costly burden of harboring the soldiery (the soldiery being neither more nor less than the entire adult male population under the age of gray hairs); and that the alarm of a general war subsides as the universal horror at the carnage rises. Neither France nor any other country can stand the drain of men and material which is now going on. The war is therefore not likely to be a long one; and the probabilities of an exhausted country attacking a fresh one are seen to be small. Our readiness to prepare for defence is unabated, and is probably too great to permit Mr. Cobden to enter the Cabinet with any satisfaction; but the violent apprehension of invasion is over. A few weeks of such warfare as is going on in Italy must incapacitate the Powers concerned for assaulting their neighbors. It would gratify me much to have to write next time about negotiations for peace. A whole wilderness of dangers for Italy would still lie ahead. It would be a miracle if she were to escape civil strife, after having expelled her foreign oppressors; and yet another danger is in the minds of all who have studied the Bonapartes. But peace must be the first incident; and the sooner it can be had, the happier shall we all be.

As to English politics—we are all resolved, from the Queen to the non-elector, to make no difficulties about the new Ministry acting together, if they themselves find it practicable. The importance of the case is so grave as to justify the most cautious and self-denying prudence all round. It is probable that nobody expects success from the experiment of combining elements which have so little affinity; but the attempt is necessary; it is the only thing to be done, and no good citizen could endure to be the cause of its failure. So we are all helping to govern the country, or allow it to be governed. Everything else is well with us. A political organization that will work is our sole difficulty in our career of genuine progress. We shall be unworthy of our unequalled blessings if we cannot put them to full use and interest, for the benefit of our multitudes at home and our nations abroad.

Yours, &c.,

H. M.

LETTER FROM FRANCES D. GAGE.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

IT is an old saying that "it is the easiest thing in the world to be mistaken," and every day's experience shows the truth of the adage. I had supposed that when I should get away from the "land of liberty," the subject of "slavery," which, for the last twenty-five years, like a vexed spirit in a haunted house, has been shaking its dry bones in our ears, would be lost sight of; and that, if it came up at all, we should have to call it ourselves and demand its presence. But, alas for our supposing! The unquiet ghost of murdered Freedom stalks through the world, rapping at the door of friends and foes, and asking a resting place in their souls. In the language of one of old, "it is in our hearts and in our mouths"—aye, in the hearts and mouths of the whole so-called civilized world, stirring up rebellion and demanding justice. Even in the swaggering defences of the horrible "system" I mark a twinge of conscience. No man who thought the thing fully and fairly right would be hunting about for palliations and defences; he would as boldly assert the right in this as he does in other cases. Who ever heard or saw a farmer holding his neighbor by the button-hole to argue with him the right or expediency of making beasts of burden of his oxen or horses? We never yet heard one attempt to substantiate his claim to his own mule, the most abused of all creatures. He only makes the bold, bare assertion, "he's mine, and I'll do as I please with him." So, when I hear the apologist for slavery expatiating upon its advantages, and telling, with softened voice, of the happiness of slaves—how Sukey and Ned enjoy more privileges than their master and mistress, dress better, live as well, belong to the church, go to balls, dance and sing, with never a care or responsibility, are kept, cared for, SUPPORTED, from the cradle to the grave—I can't help feeling that the poor soul, like the boy with his first cigar or quid of tobacco, is a little sick at the stomach. But he is determined to persevere; all *gentlemen*, members of Congress and government officials, do so, and he must learn to stand it—he must get up an excuse for it too; so he tells of having the asthma, or toothache, or a brash, and now he can't get along without it.

On the Island of Cuba we found any quantity of Americans, coming all the way from the Green Mountains of Vermont to the coast of Florida; but not one of them all that was not hunting for these evidences of good to settle their conscience with. And I do not remember one that gave a bold expression against the *morale* of the thing. Now, if slavery is such a fine thing—if these slaves are "better off than we are"—if it is so very agreeable to be relieved of individual responsibility, why don't some of these people "pitch in" (the fittest phrase I can think of)? "Oh! we are not used to it." Well, then, put your children into this enviable position; like the young smokers, they will turn pale and vomit a little at first, but they'll soon get used to it; and then to think of the satisfaction of knowing *always* that your *dear ones* are provided for! that a "good massa and missis" will see to it that they shall never fall into idle habits, or need a coarse garment to cover their nakedness, or a meal of mush and musty bacon to keep them from starving!—that no cruel *husband* shall ever take away the daughter's wages, or rob them of their children; none but the master to rule or coerce them. How happy all this would make you, to be sure! Bah! why do I write this? Just because I hear it everywhere I go; and no matter whether in Havana or San Antonio (where two out of every three are slaves), whether in the Isle of St. Thomas or of Santa Cruz, or St. Domingo, slavery, only slavery, is the subject of conversation among free people; and at the hotels and boarding-houses these arguments in its favor are constantly falling from the lips of the cigar-smoking, rum-drinking trader or gentleman traveller that meets you by the way. Nowhere is the unquiet spirit laid. This morning I went out into the market of this city of St. Domingo. I was alone; my brother had gone to sketch the outlines of the old house of Columbus, a grand old ruin on the banks of the river Osema. I stood looking at a long table of beautiful fish, glowing in the morning sunshine, in their crimson and scarlet hues, when a voice beside me said kindly—

"Good morning, madame."

I turned to meet the pleasant eye of a mulatto woman.

"Hope you are well this morning, madam."

"Quite well, I thank you, and very glad to meet one who can talk English."

"Oh! yes; I was born in America, and brought here a child."

"In what part?"

"Baltimore. Did you ever hear of that place?"

"Oh, a great many times."

"Well, now, I've been here thirty years, and I'd like to hear about it. How is it in Baltimore?"

"Oh! Baltimore is a very large city, and very beautiful too—growing larger every day and more prosperous."

"Yes, I dare say; but 'twasn't that I wanted to know. I dare say—but you know—well, I don't know as I ought to ask you; may be you wouldn't like it." She hesitated.

"Ask anything you please," I replied; "I am so glad to find some one that can speak our way that I want to talk with you; so, you ask me as many questions as you please, and then I shall ask you some."

"Well, you know, when my father and mother came away from there (we was always free folks), they had slaves in Baltimore. Does they do that now?"

She had brought her head near mine, and her voice fell almost to a whisper; her eye was starting with the intense excitement and feeling.

"Yes," I answered; "I am sorry to say they do still have slaves in Baltimore."

She drew back her head, and, with an expression of horror and dismay, she hissingly exclaimed,

"Oh! my God, you don't tell me they is doing that, all these years! It's a wicked thing, madam—a wicked thing."

I said I thought so too; we chatted a few minutes, and she turned to her work, saying she was hired out now to a farmer outside the wall, and had come in for marketing; but if God spared her till next Sunday morning, she would come in and show me out to her home, which was a beautiful place; and so we parted. I felt sad that I could not have given her a word of hope for the land of her birth, instead of dropping into her expectant ears the horrible words, "they keep slaves still in Baltimore."

Oh, when will my country throw off its reproach!

We went out to visit a little village of rude huts, built of palms, on the east side of the river. Here we found another family who came here, thirty-three years ago, from about twenty miles from Philadelphia. The children of the parents, who were black, had grown to manhood and womanhood, married and had children growing up around them. Joseph Hamilton and his wife were sensible people and able to give us much information. The late revolution had worked them damage, destroying their property and home. We were hardly seated ere the conversation ran of itself into the subject of slavery. And so it is: go high or low, among rich or poor, slavery is the topic that comes up.

The tales we have heard of the idleness and improvidence of the negroes and the restlessness of the government are too true, I fear. They do not seem a thriving people. Nor are the Spaniards one whit better. They still harbor all their old prejudices against the African blood, and expect them to do all their menial work. It is a great thing for so crushed a people to rouse and throw off the yoke of the oppressors; but a half century is not a sufficient time to wear out the old features of subserviency and submission. Though not slaves, the people have been under controllers and governors all the time. The whites, who had been masters so long, were their natural enemies, and of course felt no wish to help to elevate, or to undo the wrongs done. The white man says, "We can't labor in this hot climate," and folds his hands in idleness; and they who, for generations, had known nothing but compulsory toil had learned to look upon ease and idleness as among the legitimate blessings of freedom, and fell into the fatal error of following the fashions of their former masters. I see nothing strange in all this; it seems exactly what might be expected; and as the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children to the third and fourth generation, so shall their virtues and ways of thought. All are idle here together, and all, I fancy, will need some spurring influence ere they forget the ways of their ancestors. But, so far as I have been able as yet to discover, the black or dark-colored people do nearly all the hard work—white people, or Spaniards and French, much of the trading; the marketing is brought in by mulattoes.

It is said here that the black men hate the white people, especially Americans, and look with jealousy and dislike upon all who come, except it be the trading vessels. As I walk the streets, I find myself everywhere closely observed; every window is full of heads, and each doorway is represented; and I feel, as I bow and nod in passing, a kind of humiliation that I never felt before in having the name American. I fancy through every eye I see the question starting from the heart, "Come you not, stranger, from that land where they hold four million of our people in bondage; where they make laws that they shall not learn to read; where virtue, conjugal love, filial duty and parental affection are crimes—ties to be severed at the option of a master; where whips and chains and tortures exact toil, and the reward is the lowest necessaries? In fine, come you not from that country that has declared, through its highest tribunal, 'that the black man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect'?" And my heart must answer AYE to all this. I feel that I am in the land of colored people—a people who have wrenched the lash and chain from the hands of tyrants and declared themselves free. I put the case to myself: Would it be any more unjust for them to decree "that the white man has no rights which the black man is bound to to respect" than for us? No wonder if they hate us; no wonder if they look with suspicion on every white face that appears in their streets. But as yet I have found nothing to really impress me with a belief that this story of hatred is true, except to those who deserve it (and doubtless there are many who do). Wherever we have made ourselves known we have been treated in the most kindly manner by every class of people, and especially by the blacks. I have not failed to let them know my position on the question of slavery, when asked; and treating them as friends, I have been treated as a friend in return.

Daily, as I go to and fro, I find evidences to convince me of the strength of these people. They need help. They need means of education—a better and firmer government to aid their effort. But, even as they are, the lowest and most uncultured one of them all is better off than the most favored slave, whose every aspiration is held by his master's will.

F. D. GAGE.

Santa Cruz.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

PLAIN AND PLEASANT TALK ABOUT FRUITS, FLOWERS AND FARMING. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1859.

We have here a collection of short articles, published, ten or twelve years ago, in *The Western Farmer and Gardener*, at Indianapolis, where the writer then resided. They bear the stamp of the author's genius in every line, and the publishers have done well to dig them out of the rubbish and give them to the world in this goodly volume. The circumstances attending their original production are stated by the author in the preface, as showing the young how valuable the fragments of time may become, if judiciously employed. The continued taxation of daily preaching, extending through months, and once through eighteen consecutive months, without the exception of a single day, began to wear upon the nerves and made it necessary to seek some relaxation. Accordingly, after each week night's preaching, he used to drive the sermon out of his head by some "alterative reading." In the State Library were various standard works upon Agriculture, which he almost monopolized for years, until he became thoroughly familiar with their contents. In this way, employing only fragments of time, he gradually accumulated materials and became familiar with facts and principles, until he was qualified to conduct an agricultural journal. This employment of "waste hours" not only answered a purpose of soothing excited nerves then, but brought him into such relations to the material world that, he says, "we speak with entire moderation when we say that all the estates of the richest Duke in England could not have given us half the pleasure which we have derived from pastures, waysides and unoccupied prairies."

Mr. Beecher, in commencing his editorial labors, set forth his "creed" on the subject of farming. It will commend itself to many who would be far from giving their assent to the theological doctrines uttered in the Plymouth pulpit. It is so good that we copy it for the instruction of our readers:

OUR CREED.

We believe in small farms and thorough cultivation.

We believe that soil loves to eat, as well as its owner, and ought, therefore, to be manured.

We believe in large crops which leave the land better than they found it—making both the farmer and the farm rich at once.

We believe in going to the bottom of things, and, therefore, in deep ploughing, and enough of it. All the better if with a sub-soil plough.

We believe that every farm should own a good farmer.

We believe that the best fertilizer of any soil is a spirit of industry, enterprise and intelligence—without this, lime and gypsum, bones and green manure, marl and guano will be of little use.

We believe in good fences, good barns, good farm-houses, good stock, good orchards, and children enough to gather the fruit.

We believe in a clean kitchen, a neat wife in it, a spinning-piano, a clean cupboard, a clean dairy, and a clean conscience.

We firmly disbelieve in farmers that will not improve; in farms that grow poorer every year; in starvelling cattle; in farmers' boys turning into clerks and merchants; in farmers' daughters unwilling to work, and in all farmers ashamed of their vocation, or who drink whiskey till honest people are ashamed of them.

BLACKWOOD for July is interesting as usual. Here is

Miscellaneous Department.

THE MORNING-GLORY.

BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

We wreathed around the darling's head the morning-glory bright;
Her little face looked out beneath, so full of life and light;
So lit as with a sunrise, that we could only say
It is the morning glory true, and her poor types are they.

So always from that happy time we called her by that name,
And very fitting did it seem, for, sure as morning came,
Behind her cradle-bars she smiled to catch the first faint ray,
As from the trellis smiles the flower and opens to the day.

But not so beautiful they rear their airy cups of blue
As turned her sweet eyes to the light, brimmed with sleep's tender dew;
And not so close their tendrils fine round their supports are thrown
As these dear arms whose outstretched plea clasped all hearts to her own.

We used to think how she had come, even as comes the flower,
The last and perfect added gift to crown love's morning hour;
And how in her was imaged forth the love we could not say,
As on the little dewdrops round shines back the heart of day.

We never could have thought, O God, that she must wither up,
Almost before a day was flown, like the morning-glory's cup;
We never thought to see her droop her fair and noble head,
Till she lay stretched before our eyes, wilted, and cold, and dead.

The morning-glory's blossoming will soon be coming round;
We see their rows of heart-shaped leaves upspringing from the ground;
The tender tips the winter killed renew again their birth,
But the glory of our morning has passed away from earth.

O Earth, in vain our aching eyes stretch over thy green plain!
Too harsh thy dews, too gross thine air, her spirits to sustain;
But up in groves of Paradise full surely we shall see
Our morning-glory beautiful twine round our dear Lord's knee.

ASIATIC CIVILIZATION.

From The Christian Examiner for July.

We encounter a serious difficulty in the want of a definite standard by which to measure and appreciate other and very different races and civilizations. The traveller, or merchant, or missionary, who carries with him only his European or American scale to apply to Asiatics, gives us a report as incorrect as it is honest. Everything he sees is distorted by his point of view, even if not by his prejudices also. And when we come to read the report, we add our own prejudices and ignorances to distort the view still more. At the best, and when on the spot as travellers to see with our own eyes, we are beset with obstacles to clear vision. Our position is like that of the rich man's son, when attempting to compare his own attainments and dignity with those of the toiling multitudes around him; his palace, his pictures, his horses, his whims, his fastidiousness, blind him, so that he cannot see the dignity and wisdom, and even refinement, that are living in the poorest streets and on the coarsest fare. Many a traveller, looking on the poverty of the Hindus and Arabs, their simple habits, their cheap and often scanty covering, turns away, sad or sneering, according as his way may be, and asks if civilization can do without forks and stockings, and even go barefoot; forgetting that Socrates, the grand old Greek, went barefoot, and in a climate requiring shoes and stockings much more than Southern Asia. As to forks, it is only a few centuries since the Italians invented them; Dante, Cicero, Pericles, even Alcibiades, cynosure of delicate eyes, having eaten with their fingers: forks had not reached England when Shakespeare wrote Hamlet, and were only beginning to come in when Bacon published the Great Instauration; so that high intellectual development and refined fingers had a fair start together. It was then or a little earlier that our Europeanism fairly began. Before, we were, like the Asiatics, civilized, but not yet enlightened. As one of the best ways of curing the rich young man of his conceit is to direct his attention backward to his honored father and grandfather, whose toil and penury accumulated the advantages he misunderstands, so it is a good way to cure ourselves of our European conceit, to go back to the fifteenth century, when Europe had scarcely reached the highest Asiatic standard, and then still further back, to the tenth century, when Europe was so decidedly below Asia. So low indeed had Europe then sunk that it is a wonder how we ever came up out of so great barbarism and superstition. Of Asiatics it should be remembered that they have never known any *great* retrograde movement like our "Dark Ages"; the Chinese and Hindus once civilized having always remained civilized. We are too forgetful of our own history, our haltings and backslidings. A little looking back upon our course, so marked by barbarisms, delusions, cruelties, inquisitions, slavery, ought to shame us out of the folly of despising Asiatics because we happen for the present to have outmarched them. Only a hundred years ago, Scotland, one of the glories of our modern world, "was a poor and haggard country"; "without roads"; wheat almost unknown; "manure, when used, carried to the field on the back of the crofter's wife"; one coach only to London, starting once a month, "and the journey occupying from fifteen to eighteen days"; Sir Walter Scott knowing "a man who remembered the London post-bag, which contained the letters of all England to Scotland, arriving in Edinburgh with only one letter."* If the progress of Scotland in a hundred years has been prodigious, Asiatic history has at least one passage that is more than a match for it. In the seventh century, unlettered Arabs, half unconsciously, formed the plan of launching upon the world a manlier religion than that mixture of Judaism and Paganism which was then struggling doubtfully, almost hopelessly, under the name of Christianity, but with too little as yet of the spirit of Christ to rescue and reconstruct the wrecked and sinking fragments of the old civilizations. In seventy years they achieved, though with sublime one-sidedness, their great work—greater than anything done by Alexander or Cæsar or Napoleon—and then went on to build up a civilization almost rivalling that of the Greeks. For five hundred years they took their turn of being the foremost people of the world. They were the teachers of Europe when we most needed instruction. They stimulated us by their antagonism, as well as by their example. Wise helpers in peace, high-minded enemies in war, they fought and taught us till they made men of us. They relumed our lamp when it was going utterly out. We went to that strange school, the Crusades, superstitious and fanatical, and came back wiser and calmer, with heroism not extinguished, but rationalized and ennobled. We owe them a debt which most of our historians (Sismondi is an exception) are slow to acknowledge.

Even a century later than the fourteenth, when European progress began to require the printing-press and the discovery of a new continent, it requires an eye that looks below the surface to discern the commencing superiority of Europe. But from that time onward, while Asia has been nearly stationary, Europe, except a portion of the peasantry, so slow to move, has strode forward astonishingly, by means of developments in political liberty, freedom of thought in religion, and most of all by progress in science. It should not be wholly forgotten that so late as the sixteenth century, that illustrious period when Europeanism was girding itself so grandly for an unparalleled destiny, three of the greatest sovereigns and governments of the century were Asiatic—Akbar of India, Abbas of Persia, and Soliman the Magnificent of Turkey. The last two, it is true, tarnished their great qualities by great crimes; but these are half forgotten when we turn to the contemporary history of the West, and read of Henry VIII., murderer of wife after wife, of Philip II., unequalled ecclesiastical and theological tyrant, of the St. Bartholomew butcheries in France, with the consequent *Te Deum* in St. Peter's. The name of Akbar is a glory to any civilization that can claim it. His imperishable fame must be divided between the Mohammedans and the Hindus. The greatest and best contemporary monarchs of the West, Elizabeth and Henry IV., much as we would honor them with our gratitude, must yield the palm to Akbar.

* London Quarterly Review for October, 1855, Art. IV. p. 231.

THE CHINESE.

Of all the present civilizations of the world, the Chinese is the most independent and homogeneous. A great people, secluded from the rest of mankind by mountains, deserts, and remoteness, have been left from the first, so far as appears, to their own unaided resources, save as helped by the Supreme Helper of all. It is, then, a strictly self-made, self-evolved civilization. Giving to this fact its due weight, the result seems remarkable and encouraging. We might incline to attribute to them, as to the Greeks, some superiority of race, but for the sad inferiority of their language. It could never be that a superior race should contrive, or be content with, so poor an instrument of communication and culture. The conclusion therefore must be, not a superiority, but a peculiarity of race; and probably such a peculiarity as implies inferiority. There is in the Chinese a marked deficiency of imagination—too little of the ideal, too much of the practical. Looking at their language, it is difficult to understand how they have risen by it out of barbarism. Can it be that, without clearness and flexibility of expression and well-defined thought, men can advance on the path of improvement by some half-blind method intermediate between instinct and thought? Or may some strengthening of the will serve as a compensation for a deficiency in an important intellectual faculty? Or is the Chinese imagination of such peculiar constitution that it only slumbers, waiting for its century of blossoming? Or are the Chinese and their language destined, like the Egyptians and their hieroglyphics, the Assyrians and their cuneiform letters, to pass away, leaving us another problem to wonder over and study out? Whatever our impression respecting the Chinese and their destiny, we can hardly fail of an encouraging conclusion, from their experiment, concerning human nature and destiny in general. For here is an unseconded race, slow and plodding, believers only in tradition and old custom, hindered by the most unwieldy of languages, with no discoverable compensating advantages, yet pushing their way upward to civilization at a very early period, and holding their ground steadfastly against all enemies from within or without. Repeatedly subdued by Northern barbarians, they have always civilized their conquerors, and still pursued their undeviating march. Wonderful indeed must be the energy and tenacity of man, his ability to subdue nature, his skill to use and evade circumstances, his nearness to the Unseen Guidance and his alliance with the Infinite Strength; so that everywhere and always there may be hope and work and progress, eternal prophecy of the Future where all faith is in the Past; as if the personal and impersonal were rounded into one, Asiatic Pantheism and European Theism flowing into and complementing each other; and as if the energy and rapidity of Europe, the slowness and tenacity of Asia, the high and low tides of the one, the almost tidelessness of the other, might all coalesce and contribute to the nobility of man.

The Chinese seem to have owed their civilization chiefly to agriculture, government, morality, manufactures, commerce, and schools. No people have owed so little to worship, theology, war, poetry, and art. Marco Polo, contemporary of Dante and Giotto, the Herodotus of the Middle Ages, as Ritter calls him, going to China from what was then the foremost country of Europe, uniformly speaks of the Chinese and their civilization with respect, sometimes with admiration. He evidently looked upon them, in all except religion, as more advanced than his countrymen, the Italians. "Riding through Cathay you find always handsome cities and castles, abundance of arms and merchandise, fine inns, trees, vines, and a civilized people."

THE HINDUS.

In previous numbers of the Examiner we have spoken of the English in India with admiration. This admiration was appropriate when Englishmen, taken by surprise in the midst of their lordly and luxurious living, the claret circulating and the punkah swinging, were the next moment at their posts to prove, by achievement and endurance, that England could be as grand and heroic under Havelock and the Lawrences as ever before under the Wellington and Marlborough, the Henrys and the Edwards. But English heroes, as well as all other heroes, have their faults, which must be mentioned, since justice to Asiatics requires it. It now turns out that the barbarities of the Hindus, proclaimed so loudly throughout the civilized world, were greatly exaggerated, and that the subsequent barbarities of the English were greater and less excusable. Furthermore, it now appears that English insolence was one of the chief causes of the revolt. Evidence of these statements has been furnished abundantly by the English press and Parliament. Not as a digression, but in order that we may remove some of that prejudice through which the Hindu and Mohammedan civilizations are commonly viewed, we shall give a few quotations, to show that the enlightened world was too hasty in concluding that cruelty and barbarism had died out of Christian civilization, and lived only in heathen. We are not without hope that the tide is beginning to run, and that, in a generation or two more, Europeans and Americans will look upon Asiatics with candor, and Christians judge of Pagans and Mohammedans with charity. Yet perhaps we are too hopeful; it has been truly remarked that "as our civilization and refinement increase, we look with more abhorrence upon any departure from our confirmed habits and prejudices." The London Quarterly Review, in an able article on British India (July, 1858), says:

"Young men [Indians] who have received an education, and have passed an examination scarcely inferior in the variety and difficulty of its subjects to those of our English Universities, are treated with haughty contempt, or, at best, with condescending civility, by a youth fresh from an English school, who has just managed, by cramming or interest, to get an Indian appointment, and who is taught, the moment he puts his foot on Indian ground, to look upon the 'niggers' as of a race so inferior in every respect to himself that contact with them amounts almost to contamination. And yet these 'niggers' are men of very subtle intellect, of great reasoning powers, and of extraordinary aptitude for acquiring knowledge. No race, perhaps, shows a higher intellectual development than the Brahims of Western India, or the higher castes of Bengal. Their thirst after knowledge—whether for its own sake or for the object of obtaining employment—is unbounded. . . . . Our English mode of life, our dress, our food, and our habits are neither suited to the climate nor the people. . . . . There is no sympathy between us; we have no common interests, affections, or pleasures; we treat them with an *overbearing insolence*, a haughty contempt, or an insulting indifference. They are too generally addressed in terms of the grossest abuse. . . . . The oft repeated Anglo-Saxon assertion, that natives are unfit, by the absence of the necessary intellectual and moral qualities, to take a share in the government of the country, is rendered absurd, as much by the instances of the great men who ruled India under the ancient native dynasties as by those of Dinker Rao, Salar Jung, and other living statesmen, who have shown no less *integrity in administration* than wisdom in legislation."—pp. 130, 129, 132.

These quotations we make not to cast reproach upon the English—very far otherwise. Americans in the same circumstances would be no better, and in somewhat similar circumstances, where slavery prevails, often dishonor our common human nature by worse manifestations. Bad systems—despotism and slavery—will make even high-minded men brutal.

That our proofs may not be confined to one period or to one phase of things, we go back for a moment in our quotations to the evidence given before Parliament in 1813, when Sir Thomas Munro, that great statesman and good man, who drew to himself the affection and reverence of the multitudes of Asiatics and Europeans who knew him, bears the following strong testimony to the character and civilization of the Hindus:

"If a good system of agriculture, unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to either convenience or luxury, schools established in every village for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, the general practice of hospitality and charity amongst each other, and, above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect, and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilized people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe; and, if civilization is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country will gain by the import cargo."—*Mill and Wilson's India*, edition of 1858, p. 371.

Warren Hastings, on the same occasion, said:

"Great pains have been taken to inoculate into the public mind an opinion that the native Indians are in a state of complete moral turpitude. I affirm by the oath that I have taken, that this description of them is wholly unfounded. . . . . They are gentle, benevolent, more susceptible of gratitude for kindness shown them than prompted to vengeance for wrongs inflicted, and as exempt from the worst propensities of human passion as any people upon the face of the earth; they are superstitious, it is true, but they do not think ill of us for not thinking as they do. Gross as the modes of their worship are, the precepts of their religion are wonderfully fitted to promote the best ends of society, its peace and good order. . . . . They possess in a very high degree the principles of gratitude, affection, honor, and justice."—*Ibid*, p. 372.

The North British Review, which, on points of religious orthodoxy, will be received as good authority, says: "The Hindus can no longer be regarded as mere ignorant and fanatical worshippers of stocks and stones. In this country Christian writers have not hitherto done justice to heathenism." Sir Charles Napier said of the Indian army: "If these sepoys were not the best men in the world, they would give their commander much trouble." He could "never think of them but with respect and admiration." He calls "the manners of both armies"—the Queen's and the Company's—"toward natives of all ranks, a vulgar *bahaudering*." Such deeds were done as made him wonder that England held India a year. Lutfullah, a Mohammedan gentleman of India who travelled in Europe, remarked, with Asiatic keenness, that "the more you proceed on toward England, the more you find the English people endowed with politeness and courtesy."*

We come now to quotations fitted to make the ears of Anglo-Saxon Christians tingle. Captain Hervey, in 1850, speaks of "the harsh measures of *all classes of Europeans* towards natives. The very brutes are not so treated. To maltreat a native is considered a meritorious act." He quotes the remarks of respectable natives in regard to our religion: "You call yourselves Christians, you profess temperance, soberness, and chastity; you preach against idolatry. Where is your temperance? you are always drinking! Where is your chastity? Whom do you worship? Not God surely. Your belly is your God; vanity and self-indulgence your worship; and your religion is nothing." The Calcutta Conference of Missionaries, in 1855, say: "The ryots generally believe that the Christian religion consists in having no caste, that is, no self-respect, in eating and drinking freely, and in trampling upon the social, political and religious rights of the 'niggers.'"†

After the taking of Delhi, an officer wrote to the Bombay *Times*:

"Many will be glad to learn that women and children are allowed to go unmolested. This was a stretch of mercy *I should not have been prepared to make, had I a voice in the matter*. . . . . All the city people found within the walls when our troops entered were bayoneted on the spot, and the number was considerable, as you may suppose, when I tell you that in some houses forty or fifty persons were hiding. *These were not mutineers*, but residents of the city, who trusted to our well-known mild rule for pardon. *I am glad to say they were disappointed.*"

And this in the nineteenth century of Christ, among the most Christian of the Christian nations! Let us not speak of Asiatic cruelty, of heathen bloodthirstiness. Mr. Ludlow himself says:

"A relation of mine wrote to me from India, only the other day, that he had known a European officer who kept an orderly for the sole purpose of thrashing his native servants; that another was recently tried for beating his orderly because he did not thrash his servants hard enough. Another relative of mine, an officer in a Bombay regiment, wrote lately in terms of just disgust at the conduct of the young officers of his corps towards their native servants—maltreating them, leaving their wages unpaid for a twelvemonth—and yet some of these men were so faithful that they would pawn their own clothes to procure grain for their master's horses."

Another witness declares:

"If a man who left India thirty years ago were now to revisit it, he would scarcely credit the change he would universally witness in the treatment of the natives, high and low. The English were not then absolute masters everywhere. *Now they are.*"

Alas! it is a fearful thing for any of us to be intrusted with unlimited power. Besides, the Anglo-Saxon race, wherever found, manifest a peculiar scorn of the dark races and their peculiarities. Whatever advantages of race or culture or religion we may possess, freedom from prejudice is not among them. We persist in holding that all good things are of one kind and fashion, and that our own. We cannot easily admit that there may be more than one good color for the skin, more than one good form of government, more than one style of beauty, more than one good religion, more than one commendable routine of manners and customs. Even in food we have our prejudices. This was ludicrously shown in the case of an English lady, long absent from England, who, on returning, wept to find she had lost the taste for roast-beef. Lesson upon lesson we must have before we can so far rid ourselves of prejudice as to do justice to Asiatics. And when we partially succeed in curing ourselves of this prejudice, we are suspected of degeneracy. Strange to say, the prejudice of race and religion seems strongest among those who hold it as a sacred dogma that all races originated in Adam, and that all the sound morality and theology found among the Chinese, Hindus and Persians came, in some way, from our Bible. It should seem to be a legitimate inference from such a creed that all men are brethren, and that all religions are related, and therefore to be treated tenderly—at least fairly.

The basis of Hindu civilization is broader than that of the Chinese. Besides agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, which belong to the two in common, to an extent not equalled in Europe till the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Hindu civilization has been eminently aided by worship, war, and poetry,—helps to which China has owed little. In government the Hindus have been weak, except in the local governments of villages, while the Chinese have been strong. In philosophy the Chinese have been respectable, the Hindus highly so. In language, a higher instrument of civilization, the Hindus have been very strong, the Chinese very weak. In morality, the four civilizations—Chinese, Hindu, Mohammedan, and European—seem to have been about equal till the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. If Europe was superior in some points of morality, Asia was as much superior in others. In fact, taking religion in its broad sense, as comprehending worship, morality, theology, and church, Europe could claim little superiority over Asia till the time of Luther. An absurd assertion this to strict Catholics, and a puzzling one to those Protestants whose aversion to heathenism is scarce equalled by their hatred of Romanism, but sufficiently accurate to those Protestants and Catholics who consider Luther a great blessing to our common Christianity, who look at Oriental religion through a clearer medium than Occidental prejudice, and who perceive that all religions and moralities, still more all theologies, are meandering streams, not the straight canals our dogmatisms decree. If it be said that Europe before Luther, however superstitious, had no Jacquisition—a more horrible thing, yet so deeply imbedded in Europeanism that its spirit still afflicts, in modified forms, some of the most enlightened regions of Europe and America. Bigotry and intolerance are little known among Chinese and Hindus, though nearly as common among Mohammedans as among Christians. It is humiliating to think, ard a salutary lesson if we will receive it, that so good a thing as religion may be proud and unbrotherly, dogmatic and insulting. Dwelling fondly on the whole history of our civilization and religion, even the darker passages, we are slow to perceive that we may in some things learn truth and a Christ-like spirit from other religions and races; that even Asiatics may sometimes, with reason, turn away from our too narrow and hard-hearted theology, our complacent philanthropy, our too arrogant ecclesiasticism. The universality of our claims is in singular contrast with the partialism of our dogmas, and even of our practice. Some of us have proceeded so far in tolerance as to bear with other races and other complexions, without being able to enlarge our charity sufficiently to comprehend other religions also. It is a serious fault in our religious education that we are taught to underrate all religions but our own. The poor Irishman we can often bear with as a Celt, but not as a Papist. The African or Hindu we can treat with tenderness and respect as a black man, but not as a heathen or Mohammedan. To some it is a justification of aggressive wars and the slave trade that black men thereby have Christianity imposed upon them; to a far larger number, this gain to Christianity is felt to be some apology for the wrong. We have yet to learn, and we shall learn it, that the religious convictions and sincere worships of others are as sacred as our own. What we now pride ourselves in as Christian toleration is often nothing but ecclesiastical insolence—a relic of barbarism to be civilized out of us. The Inquisition dies hard. It lingers on, in spiritual assumption, sectarian narrowness, theological unfairness and bigotry, sanctimonious slander.

MOHAMMEDANISM.

Of all the great civilizations of Asia and the world, Mohammedanism has the narrowest basis, has been developed by the fewest instrumentalities. Religion, war and poetry have been the great forces by which it has grown into such vast dimensions. Law, philosophy, commerce, agriculture, manufactures, have contributed their aid in less degree than in other civilizations. It is a simple, grand, energetic development, but not manifold and comprehensive. In agriculture and manufactures the Mohammedans have always been behind the Chinese and Hindus, owing chiefly, we suppose, to inferiority of soil and other physical hinderances. We are accustomed to condemn the Mohammedans for despotism, polygamy, and the degradation of woman. But it is not they alone who are chargeable with these sins. Despotism has always prevailed in Asia, and always will till a higher civilization is developed. The Anglo-Indian government is as despotic as other Asiatic governments, and necessarily so. Polygamy also is an Asiatic rather than a Mohammedan evil. Europe owes its freedom from polygamy, and the higher position of its women, to a combination of favorable circumstances and influences. Monogamy prevailed in Greece, was still stronger in Rome; and respect for women was a marked peculiarity of the Germanic tribes. During the Middle Ages, the ideal of woman, and as a consequence her condition, was still further elevated by Mariolatry, chivalry, and the home influences of feudal castles; so that at the close of the Middle Ages the woman of Europe was considerably higher than the woman of Asia, though the superiority of the European man was only beginning to be discernible. The extent to which polygamy prevails in Asia has been somewhat exaggerated, and so also has the degradation of woman. In Arabia, Persia, India and China the condition of woman on the whole corresponds with the stage of civilization. While polygamy is permitted throughout Asia (as it has been from time immemorial), monogamy is the common practice. Nature enforces it in all countries and climates, under all religions. By fixing our attention on the harems of Utah and Constantinople, we may incline to a different opinion; but a broader survey will bring us back to the conclusion that polygamy is only the exception. That it is a great evil, wherever it prevails, is certain. It shows itself in its worst forms in the notorious harems of sultans, pachas, rajahs, and Mormons.

Mohammedan civilization is now in eclipse, or, as many think, in decline, owing to a combination of adverse causes. First, its military power is paralyzed by the military science of Christendom; and Islam is too proud and self-reliant to borrow of Christians. The example of Runjeet Sing and the Sikhs shows what *can* be accomplished by Asiatics, when willing to borrow the military discipline and science of Europe. Secondly, the Turks, the least civilized of the greater Mohammedan races, and the most recently arrived from barbarism, having risen to the first military and political position, have proved too ignorant to maintain it. Thirdly, the Mohammedans, unlike the Hindus and the Chinese, have had no broad agricultural basis to fall back upon—the most *conservative* and *stable* of civilizing influences. Tyre, Athens, Carthage, in ancient times, Venice and Portugal in modern, wanting a numerous agricultural class, were also short-lived. Fourthly, Islamism, having a narrower basis than any other contemporary civilization, manifests its comparative weakness as soon as one only of its elements of strength fails.

The distinctly religious element of Islam, contrary to common opinion, is probably, on the whole, as strong as ever; perhaps it has even gained in some directions more than it has lost in others. In heroism and intensity it has declined; but in power of habit and unyielding tenacity, it is as strong as any religion has ever been or can be; in its ability to spread itself by spiritual influences and peaceful conquests, it has been for four centuries, and is still, the leading religion of the world. Christianity, since the fifteenth century, has greatly improved itself by internal reform and development—has spread itself extensively by colonization—has, in South America, Mexico, and the Philippine Islands, established itself by conquest; but as a *proselyting* power it has accomplished little. The Roman Catholics, from the fourteenth century, have exerted themselves with great zeal to make converts; their perseverance and self-denial continue to the present time; but the results are insignificant. Protestants began their missionary labors a hundred and fifty years ago, and during the last fifty years have rivalled the Catholics in zeal and surpassed them in the expenditure of pecuniary resources, but with even less success. These statements, however contrary to popular impressions, are not made rashly, nor without careful attention to facts. Limited and temporary successes have encouraged earnest and hopeful men and women in their praiseworthy labors and sufferings; but it may now be considered as established by the experiments of more than four centuries, made in all methods, upon all races, that Christianity, in its present stage of development, and in the present state of the world, has little to expect from propagandism—though considerable good, of various sorts, may be hoped for from the *efforts* in that direction. Meanwhile, during the progress of these varied and widely extended Christian experiments, Islam, by spontaneous and not spasmodic movement, has been quietly spreading itself through the Asiatic islands, through large portions of Africa, and to some extent in the cities of India. Half the conquests of Islam have been made without the sword, and the greater part of its peaceful triumphs have been achieved since it has been working side by side with Christianity. All great prevailing religions have their periods of proselytism—periods when external conditions and internal adaptations favor this method of extension. The Portuguese, who have exerted themselves in the cause of propagandism with as much zeal and success as any portion of Christendom, worked as rivals of the Mohammedans in the Indian Archipelago, but were immeasurably outstripped by them. Conditions and adaptations favored the Oriental faith, but not the Occidental; this is the philosophy of so great difference of result. Mohammedan increase by propagandism, since the fourteenth century, amounts to probably forty millions or more; that of Christianity, in the same way and time, may amount to two or three millions, mostly Roman Catholic converts. One reason why Christianity, especially in its Protestant form, does not find ready reception among half-civilized and barbarous races is that the missionaries are so widely separated from them in habits, sympathies, developments, complexion. Between the Christians on the one side and the Malays, Javanese, Dyaks and the African tribes on the other, there are no mutual understandings and attractions—no *permanent* bonds of union. For such races the Arab trader and colonist is by far the fittest and most successful propagandist. Mohammedanism during these last four centuries has spread itself much as Christianity did in the first five or six centuries of the Church—quite as extensively and by similar adaptations; but this extension has attracted far less attention, because the converted races are less important, and far removed from the central regions of human development. In most instances where Mohammedanism has been received voluntarily (the cases where this or any other faith has been propagated by force *alone* are few), it has proved an elevating influence. This is strikingly seen in the case of the Bugis of Celebes, who three centuries ago were unlettered pagans, but who, after receiving Mohammedanism (which they received while Christianity was at the door pressing for admission), invented an alphabet, established government, developed commerce, and are now making more vigorous advances towards a superior civilization than any race of the Archipelago has ever done.

In the matter of race, many of the Mohammedans of Asia appear to have every requisite for a higher culture. The Arabs, the Persians, the Turks, the Affghans, the Beloochees, and many of the Moslems of India, are fine races of men. Military science is likely, sooner or later, to take root among these races, some of whom have already, in an eminent degree, every other qualification for superior soldiers and able generals. Military science will open the way for other science, and then will come rivalship with Europe. Such is the order of development in Russia. There is less of civilization in Russia (the nobles excepted) than in Southern Asia, and the religion certainly is not superior, but military science and energetic government are preparing the way for general elevation throughout the Russian empire. Similar results are more than possible in many portions of Asia. Those high qualities of race which enabled the Arabs to stride forth suddenly, in advance of all the races, continue unchanged, ready as ever to fascinate the Oriental world with revelation and valor and poetry. On the whole, there seems to be sufficient reasons for concluding that Mohammedanism, though declining in some respects and in some localities, has not yet fully accomplished the work which Providence has given it to do.

GENERAL REMARKS.

In order to complete our survey and estimate of Asiatic civilization, it remains to compare it, somewhat more definitely and directly than we have yet done, with the civilization of Europe. The suggestions we have thrown out may be sufficient to fix attention upon the important fact, that the inferiority of Orientalism did not become manifest till the sixteenth century, when Europe entered upon its great career, surpassing its own past unfolding, as well as all other revelations of humanity. The roots of this European superiority may be traced back through the Middle Ages to the wonderful civilization of the Greeks, but to do any justice to this part of the general history of civilization would entirely exceed our limits. It will be seen that our present civilization has a broader and more complex basis than that of any of the civilizations of Asia. The riches of the past, the blood and nutriment of many races and the best, the accumulations of many nations and empires, the beauties and sublimities of the noblest arts, the treasures of the choicest literatures and philosophies, the sanctities and moralities of the truest and best religions (one of them the best of all)—all these foundations and disciplines, whether borrowed or inherited or developed, predetermined Europe rather than Asia to be the birthplace of Bacon and the sciences. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the superiorities and vast possibilities of European culture were beginning to be obscurely revealed, here and there; but in the sixteenth and all the following centuries, Asia has been left far behind. Besides the moral and intellectual causes suggested for this difference of destiny, there has been a special physical cause in the peculiar configuration of Europe, its seas and coasts and climate, which we can only thus hint at and pass on.

Inferiority is less seen in the laboring than in the intellectual classes of Asia. In fact, the lower orders of Asiatics are superior to the corresponding classes in Europe, so far as it respects actual attainments in some of the valuable results of civilized society, apart from all questions of future promise. They are more temperate, more submissive to reason and law, have more confirmed habits of order and self-control, are more polished in manners, are further removed from riots and mobs and the grosser crimes. They have acquired the habit of living on little, thus maintaining their civilization at a cheaper rate; they succeed better in making poverty and self-respect go together. The civilized European (particularly the Englishman and his descendants in America, both manifesting herein a younger and weaker civilization than that of the French and the Italians) bears about a ponderous burden of expense, which is a millstone about his neck; the Asiatic, having cheaper wants, older and stronger habits of decorum and sobriety, can lose money without losing caste, can rise or fall in style with less elevation or depression of soul. The vices and excesses of the courts of Indian princes—anomalous courts in which there is nothing to do, while there are ample revenues to be squandered on vicious idleness—are not to be taken as specimens of the habits of the people. When the time of self-government shall return (as return it must, for the blunders and insults and taxations of foreigners cannot be eternal), these corrupt and idle courts, corrupt because idle, will be swept away.

There is not sufficient reason for believing that the Asiatic man is dying out because he is old, and because he is below our standard in some things, and rejects our ideals in others. The Jews are old and scattered, and long ago lost their nationality, but exhibit no indications of decay; the Armenians and Parsees have had a similar history with similar results; all three are vigorous and superior Asiatic races, without nationality, yet with as sure prospect of a long and prosperous future as any race. The Hindus manifest no symptoms of decay; they are protected from *permanent* European intrusion by climate, as well as religion and caste. What race but the Arab, and what religion but that of Mohammed (to be greatly improved it may be hoped), is fitted to find a home in Arabia? Mohammed was only a reformer and organizer of religious, social and military ideas as old as the times of Abraham and Job, and how much older we know not. In Persia, Europeans can live, so far as climate is concerned; but they will meet with powerful, and probably successful, rivals in that superior race of men (now followers of Mohammed after a fashion of their own) whose ancestors had the misfortune (for us, the good fortune) to lose the battle of Marathon, and to have boasting and hostile Greeks for their historians. In China, also, climate will allow European colonization; but in crowding, trading, cheating, working, economizing, they will find such competition as they have never before encountered. It must be long, if ever, before the Chinese can be elbowed out of China, even by insolent European Americans.

Is Asia, then, to remain unchanged? Certainly not. Railroads and telegraphs and military science are becoming naturalized in India. They will be welcomed by the Chinese. European machinery and manufactures will follow; for the Hindus and Chinese will make the best, and by far the cheapest, factory operatives in the world. These changes will draw after them others. Scientific agriculture will be introduced; and at length pure science. Education is already extending and improving. In some of the languages of India, the press, *in the hands of natives*, is beginning to exert a considerable influence. Religions are becoming modified and reformed. To nourish and water, without inundating, all this growth and progress, there will be colonies of Europeans and Americans, wherever commerce attracts and climate favors. By this contact and commerce of Europeans, Americans, and Asiatics, new races of men will be developed. Let us not flatter ourselves that the Creator has exhausted himself upon Anglo-Saxons. The laws of climate and race move on, revealing, as they move, the Unwearied Wisdom, independent of our parliaments, congresses, synods, our prophets, priests, philanthropists; in other phrase, God is everywhere, pervading all matter and spirit, all history and civilization, and moulding them after the eternal ideals. The last star is not yet discovered, nor created; nor the last race. Changes and improvements in Oriental society are coming, greater and better than we can plan or predict or conceive. That wide-spread monotony of governorships, collectorships, chaplaincies, punkahs, beef and beer, which the English imagination paints as the future of Asia, need not disturb the dreams of the philosopher or the artist; neither need we fear for Asia the equally afflicting prospect of American caucuses, camp-meetings, tract-societies, unventilated court-rooms and conventicles, unamused youth, unexpanded manhood, ungenial age. These two Anglo-Saxon civilizations are energetic, rapidly improving, highly commendable in the main, unsurpassed in ancient or modern times, unequalled save by Greece, Germany, France and Italy, but as yet too confined, dogmatic, unartistic, unsympathizing. The Persians, the Arabians, the Hindus, the Chinese, while learning much from us, will also be our teachers, and help to form the great Asiatic races and nations and religions and civilizations that are to be. Be not startled, good reader, at these suggestions. To thine own physical and spiritual system, how many races contribute their blood, how many worships and cultures their influence! And if the past has been so abundant and various, why not the future also?

We write in the interest of human brotherhood; in the persuasion that Anglo-Saxons, however grand their destiny, however prolonged their history, are not to go filibustering for ever round the world, crushing under their hard heel all the races and colors and systems and ideals that differ from their own. Surely Asiatics also are children of the good God, who watches their history, influences their nationalities, guides their progressions, perpetuates and modifies their races, restores their declensions, as truly as our own. Half the world, the older and larger, is not left Fatherless, as our dogmas teach. Long ago it was said by a wise Hindu that "*God is the God of all mankind*, and not of Mohammedans only"; nor of Anglo-Saxons alone, he might have added, if living now, when these noble but narrow men are, if possible, even more exclusive (many of them, not all) than the followers of Mohammed. Theirs is the old Jewish spirit, which could not see beauty and truth apart from the Hebrew Scriptures and traditions. Against this bigotry the Christians fought their battle and triumphed, so enlarging the Jewish pale as to take in the worlds of Greece and Rome and Germany, preparing for themselves new and broader Scriptures and traditions. But here they stopped to gather up their gains, and harmonize their antagonisms. The remainder of the human family, then almost unknown, was left outside, beyond sympathy and appreciation. There they are still left. And now, as many claim, they may be admitted within the pale of brotherhood only on the hard condition of renouncing what they have learned from the Universal Teacher, the education secured by many thousand years of development under the all-comprehending Providence. Even the spirit of toleration, a high virtue attained throughout two-thirds of Asia, must be renounced, and Asiatics, if admitted to our fellowship, must come in stripped of their best attainments, and degraded. And this exclusiveness is set up as the only true Christianity! When shall men, "unscaling their long-abused sight," look forth with as free an eye on the world of man, his worships and beliefs and cultures, as on the world of matter, on the stars and the strata, the attractions and orbits? Does not more than half of our present Christian civilization come from the Greeks and Romans and Germans? Why forbid that it be still further enlarged and enriched? When shall we understand that God is universal, pervading the universe, and not dwelling outside of it in some sectarian corner—pouring his inspirations through all men and all ages—recognizing a general harmony in the vast chorus of variously modulated voices? Has not the Creator and Educator of all long enough and widely enough set us the example of comprehensiveness? Let us then at length make room for our brethren the Hindus, the Chinese, the Mohammedans, to worship the common Father at the common altar; doing no injustice to any; abating no reasonable claims of our own; forbidding no partialities, nor even prejudices, except such as war against the general toleration and harmony; and so, as the humane result, securing the rights, the developments, the adaptations, the excellences, the nationalities, the civilizations of all. Even if we insist on drinking commonly, as hitherto, each from his own sectarian tank, let us not ignore the great living streams of general thought, the wide seas of common sentiment. While each shall think his own thought, pray his own prayer, frequent his own church, let us also learn to walk reverently through the venerable groves of the ages, and to worship unreluctantly in the spacious cathedrals of man. It is time we had grasped St. Paul's idea, that God is God of Gentile as well as Jew; that in Heathendom as well as Christendom the kingdom of God is *within* us, and the kingdom of evil also; that we are in one great school, though in widely different classes and grades, from Plato and Paul and Bacon and Leibnitz in the highest, to Batta and Dyak and Australian in the lowest.

* Lutfullah's Travels, p. 376.

† For this last quotation, and for several others, we are indebted to the valuable Lectures of J. H. Ludlow, Vol. II. pp. 355-366.

CRADLE SONG.

FROM THE GERMAN—BY C. T. B.

Evening is balmy and cool in the West,
Lulling the golden bright meadows to rest,
Twinkle like silver stars in the skies,
Greeting the two little slumbering eyes,
Sweetly sleep! sweetly sleep!
Thy watch the good angels in Paradise keep.

Now all the flowers are gone to repose,
All the sweet incense-cups peacefully close,
Blossoms rocked lightly on evening's mild breeze,
Drowsily, dreamingly, swing the trees;
Sweetly sleep! sweetly sleep!
Thy watch the good angels in Paradise keep.

Wise little elves, by the light of the moon,
Sing to my darling a lullaby soon;
Rise from your cells in the cups of the flowers,
Weave him a golden dream all the night hours!
Sweetly sleep! sweetly sleep!
Thy watch the good angels in Paradise keep.

Weave him a rosy and weave him a mild
Heavenly Spring-time, the beautiful child,
Leading in slumber that soft little hand,
Far into dream-land, the magical land.
Sweetly sleep! sweetly sleep!
Thy watch the good angels in Paradise keep.

Sleep till the flowers are opening once more,
Sleep till the lark in the morning shall soar,
Sleep till the golden bell's heavenly chime
Festively welcome the morning's prime.
Sweetly sleep! sweetly sleep!
Thy watch the good angels in